

# RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

A PLATFORM FOR THE FREE DISCUSSION OF  
ISSUES IN THE FIELD OF RELIGION AND  
THEIR BEARING ON EDUCATION

MARCH - APRIL 1950



RELIGIOUS EDUCATION FOR LIBERAL PROGRESSIVES  
A STATEMENT AND EVALUATIONS

ABSTRACTS OF DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS  
IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION, 1948-1949

BOOK REVIEWS

# Religious Education

Seeks to present, on an adequate, scientific plane, those factors which make for improvement in religious and moral education. The Journal does not defend particular points of view, contributors alone being responsible for opinions expressed in their articles. It gives its authors entire freedom of expression, without any official endorsement. Articles in Religious Education are indexed in the EDUCATION INDEX which is on file in educational institutions and public libraries.

Membership in the Association is \$4.00 or more per year, of which \$3.50 is for subscription to the Journal. Single copies, \$1.00 each.

## EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

LEONARD A. STIDLEY, Professor of Religious Education, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Chairman.

EDNA L. ACHESON, First Unitarian Church, Chicago, Ill.

EMANUEL GAMORAN, Commission on Jewish Education, Cincinnati, Ohio.

WALTER M. HORTON, Professor Systematic Theology, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College.

THOMAS S. KEPLER, Professor New Testament, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College.

HERBERT G. MAY, Professor Old Testament, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College.

RUTH SHRIVER, Church of the Brethren, Elgin, Ill.

---

LEONARD A. STIDLEY, Editor  
Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio

OTTO MAYER, Business Manager  
20 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago 4, Ill.

## The Religious Education Association

Editorial and Publication Office, 29 N. Pleasant St., Oberlin, Ohio

Printed at 48 S. Main Street, Oberlin, Ohio

Executive Office, 20 West Jackson Blvd., Chicago 4, Illinois

Published bi-monthly. Printed in the U. S. A.

# RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

VOLUME XLV

MARCH-APRIL, 1950

NUMBER 2

## CONTENTS

	Page
<b>Religious Education for Liberal Progressives</b>	
A Statement ----- <i>Ernest J. Chave</i>	67
Evaluations -----	72
George A. Coe	Solomon B. Freehof
William C. Bower	Emanuel Gamoran
Mrs. Marguerite Harmon Bro	Nevin C. Harner
Israel S. Chipkin	Hugh Hartshorne
Stewart G. Cole	C. Ivar Hellstrom
Gaines S. Dobbins	Myron T. Hopper
Frank and Mildred Eakin	F. Ernest Johnson
Leon Fram	Frank M. McKibben
J. Paul Williams	
Abstracts of Doctoral Dissertations in Religious Education, 1948-1949 -----	101
Significant Evidence ----- <i>Ernest M. Ligon and Myrtle C. Nash</i>	115
Book Reviews -----	119

Entered as second-class matter January 23, 1948 ,at the Post office at Oberlin, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

BIENNIAL MEETING  
OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

MAY 1-2, 1950

at

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY  
New York City

THEME

*"Growing Edges of Religious Education at Mid-Century"*

Areas to be Explored

1. Church and State in Education
  2. Family Life Education
  3. Curriculum of Religious Education
  4. Counseling for Personal Reconstruction
- 

Chairman of Program Committee and Host for the Biennial Meeting  
— Professor Samuel L. Hamilton, 80 Washington Square East, New York  
3, N. Y. Write for details of program.

---

The Mid-Winter Meeting of the Religious Education was held in  
Columbus, Ohio, February 12, 1950.

There were three definite outcomes of this meeting.

1. Preliminary reports were given of contributions and pledges which have been secured in the expansion program.
2. Plans were completed for the coming of Professor Harrison S. Elliott as General Secretary of the Religious Education Association beginning September 1, 1950.
3. Plans were also completed for the national financial expansion program.



# Religious Education

## FOR LIBERAL PROGRESSIVES

### A Statement and Evaluations

*Religious Education has varied interpretations. In a search for clarification of these two steps were taken.*

*(1) A statement setting forth an interpretation of basic concepts in religious education was secured from Professor E. J. Chave.*

*(2) This statement was forwarded to other religious educators asking them to evaluate it and to set forth their own basic concepts of religious education.*

*We are indebted to Professor Chave and seventeen other religious educators who have contributed replies, for a clarification of "Religious Education for Liberal Progressives."*

—The Editorial Committee

## RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

### For Liberal Progressives

ERNEST J. CHAVE

*Professor of Religious Education, Divinity School, University of Chicago.*

BY LIBERAL we mean open-minded to free inquiry in all phases of religion, with expectancy of growth in insights and refined achievements. By progressive we mean experimental, desirous of improvements, prepared to act along lines of promise for human betterment. By religious education we mean a comprehensive program, involving trained people working intelligently and cooperatively through many agencies of the social order, seeking to make developing moral and religious ideas and ideals meaningful and operative in personal-social living.

By liberal we do not mean merely critical, broadminded and tolerant, with no convictions or with a fluent academic use of moral and religious verbiage. By progressive we do not mean skilled in putting the frills of modern education on traditional propaganda techniques in order to indoctrinate non-critical minds. By religious education we do not mean methods of transmitting sectarian systems of doctrine and practice, and

of developing emotional loyalties to outgrown concepts and institutions. Religious education is more than a stereotyped Sunday School program.

There is an urgent need for radical changes in the teaching of morals and religion. On every side traditional religionists, administrators and theologians, preachers and writers, are bemoaning the failure of organized religion to affect the standards and practices of personal-social living. Traditional teachings fail to grip the imagination or intellect of people accustomed to scientific ways of thinking. Pre-scientific concepts control most of the language and conventional expressions of religion. The world is divided into two opposing realms, the sacred and the secular, the supernatural and the natural, and the deities of the theologians are unable to function in the total world. Churches have become competing sects, and there is no spirit of unity or common concern for the urgent human needs that demand attention. Ecumenical movements tend to be vaguely sen-

timental with time spent chiefly discussing ideologies and vested interests. At the same time a thousand non-ecclesiastical organizations are revealing spiritual interests and constructive activities. A great latent power of idealism is being discovered as people in all realms of life struggle for the basic meanings and values of an expanding world. The gigantic problems of conflicting socio-economic and cultural forces demand vision, faith, and skillful action. In response men and women are showing spiritual sensitivity, creative ingenuity, and cooperative persistence in their efforts to build a better social order. Educational leaders, scientists, labor leaders, governmental administrators, social service workers, journalists, radio commentators, and scores of others working through different agencies, are seeking to correct human faults and shortcomings and to develop life on higher levels. There is the same spirit and general outlook in such people as in professional religionists of the best kind. Some of them are churchmen, and some never go to church, but at heart and in action they are deeply religious. They frequently put to shame those theologically crippled who have no faith in man and vainly call on an imaginary deity for supernatural intervention. And it would be a sad indictment of religion if in this twentieth century of Christianity the leavening and transforming power of spiritual ideals were not prevalent in all areas of our common life. Those who are pessimistic, yearning for miraculous change, fail to appreciate the slow growth process by which personalities mature and society attains its higher forms.

This is the day for religious liberals to assert themselves. They need to prove their philosophy by constant reference to concrete illustrations of spiritual growth, evaluating and integrating them into meaningful patterns of life. Instead of losing themselves in discussions of abstract ideologies let them make clear the growth process in all matters of morals and religion. Let them find a language of common discourse so that neither technical jargons, nor vague sentimental attachments, prevent people of fundamentally similar interests from thinking and working

together. Liberals must learn to work in new ways, through reconstructed church organizations, and through many other agencies which deal with critical human needs. Instead of trying to add religion as a set of strange beliefs and customs to overcrowded and confused lives let growing persons become aware of the latent powers within themselves and in the processes in which they live, move and have their being. Spiritual meanings and values are inherent in the everyday primary relationships. Growing persons need to appreciate the multiple possibilities in the common life, the alternatives of good and evil, the essential conditions for significant achievements in personal-social living. They should not be satisfied to accept the frequent dualism of sacred and secular, of natural and supernatural, but should seek a unified philosophy of meaningful values.

Too many liberals, or like-to-be-called liberals, have failed to reach fundamental convictions, or they lack the moral fibre to follow their convictions. They are content to analyze, to discuss the various sides of controversial issues, and to remain in a non-committal neutral position. One reason that conservative traditionalists receive more attention than the liberals is that they have convictions and present their views of religion with a positiveness that invites others to share their stable position. The liberal can never succeed as a mere academic protester against obsolete ideas and practices. He must be creative, able to show the advantages of a developing point of view, ready to demonstrate his constructive insight and plan of action. He must be willing to take criticism, and in many situations to work with a minority, but he cannot be satisfied to be only a dissenter. In some cases liberals have tried to maintain a position of their own, without accepting responsibility for helping to change the ideas, attitudes, and habits of others. One who prides himself on being a liberal progressive recently said to the writer, "It's foolish to disturb the rank and file of people. Give them what they want." The indictment of medical practitioners who seek to pacify their patients instead of treating them for

their real ills, might be applied to many "liberals." A recent article scored the unethical quackery of doctors who follow the doctrine of "Placebo" (I will please), dispensing harmless pills instead of correcting physical and mental ills. Some liberals need to improve their ethics. Some situations may need difficult surgery, and others may require long time treatments but placebo is no motto for a sincere religionist.

Any reader of this article could list changes that need to be made if modern moral and religious education is to become a significant factor in our present world order. Perhaps the first change that one might suggest is to clearly define the developmental nature of morals and religion, showing that they are not abstract truths that can be dogmatically and authoritatively settled and propagated. They are essentially products of culture, growing insights into the basic meanings and values of a very complex social life. They arise functionally as people try to get satisfactory answers to ever recurring, but ever changing problems of cosmic and human relationships. People of old came to many difficult conclusions and stated their beliefs and norms in different ways, and in our contemporary world they are doing the same. It is foolish to try to rationalize any particular doctrine, or custom, or system, that arose in the past and to try to get conformity to it. The results of this kind of teaching is to make religion divisive, sectarian, impotent, in a complex world. Liberals must refuse the temptation to oversimplify moral and religious teachings, substituting abstract impersonal concepts for naive anthropomorphisms. Right and wrong may be differentiated in general terms, but specific adjustments require sensitive intelligent action in relationships that are usually very complex. To develop moral judgment we need patient, wise guidance of growing persons, with training in analysis of factors, balancing of alternatives, cooperative thinking, experimental action, and skillful re-evaluation and integration of experiences. To develop religious concepts, values, and practices likewise involves a careful process of education. The idea of God is the outstanding illustration of

this need. Though some uncritical habituated minds say "Everyone believes in God," the fact is that the idea of God has been one of the most persistent problems of theologians and philosophers through the centuries. To personify the creative, sustaining forces of our universe, is not to understand them. To argue skillfully for some system of doctrine as to the nature and will of God is worth no more than the pre-suppositions with which one begins his argument. Children, youth, and adults must learn to understand the differences between symbols and reality, between speculative hypotheses and scientific conclusions or working judgments. The teaching of liberals should keep them close to the growing knowledge of the processes of life, so that they are able to live wisely in a real world, instead of thinking of religion as escape to a dream world. Let growing persons appreciate the fact that man is the product of personality-producing forces, that he is dependent upon powers much greater than himself, but do not let them feel that giving these creative forces the name God puts one immediately into constructive relations with them, or him. Most religious education uses the technique of repetition to establish the idea of God, but leaves the organization of experience vague and subject to endless problems. If God is to be kept as the name for the integrating qualities of our universe which support personal-social values, let the evidence of moral order as well as physical grow out of a fair evaluation of experiences, and let the constituent factors of growing faith rest on increasing appreciation of the growth process, of love and mutually dependent values, of the significance of persons in the total scheme of things.

As the educational process is further developed let the liberal give connotation to all phases of his teaching, instead of multiplying vague sentimental phrases and customs. If religion is to be recognized as a pervasive quality of all living let it be analyzed into its functional factors, and identify clearly what is meant by the religious way, or the spiritual attainments. The writer has attempted to do this in his book, *A Functional Approach*

to *Religious Education*.<sup>1</sup> Let the reader try these out and modify them as he will, but let him try to find categories of developing experiences which may indicate how religion grows in growing persons living in different cultural situations. The ten categories that the writer has used, and which have proved meaningful to Protestant, Jew, and Catholic, to general educators as well as to many religious educators, are as follows:

*Sense of Worth*—growing appreciation of the potentialities in humans which lift them above the animal and mechanistic levels of behavior. Whoever, or whatever releases a human personality, stimulating vision and ambition, contributes toward religious or spiritual growth.

*Social Sensitivity*—growing recognition that others have the same kind of needs, interests, and capacities that we do: Development of ability to take the role of others, to become interested in helping them realize their potentialities; big enough to consider one's own worth and others at the same time.

*Appreciation of the Universe*—growing discovery of the laws and resources in the universe which support man's upward climb; understanding what processes have led men to believe in God; readiness to work cooperatively in the creative process seeking maximum fulfillment of personal-social possibilities.

*Discrimination in Values*—growing ability and desire to differentiate between values, with a readiness to sacrifice lesser for greater and more enduring objectives; refinement of life.

*Responsibility and Accountability*—growing appreciation of obligations involved in use of freedom; self-discipline; sense of mutual obligations in achieving individual and social ends.

*Cooperative Fellowship*—growing recognition of the superiority of cooperation over the jungle spirit of competition; desire to transform group life so that individual life may have its largest fulfillment; appreciation of the Christian ideals in the Kingdom of God.

*Quest for Truth and Realization of Values*—growing insight into basic meanings and values, with constant search for fuller

knowledge and means of attaining ideals; refusal to accept dogmas or magical techniques; appreciation of the processes of growth.

*Integration of Experiences into Working Philosophy*—growing understanding of the principles which operate in the conflicting and perplexing experiences of life and death, suffering and happiness, justice and injustice, good and evil; weaving a pattern of life from the many strands of varied human experience.

*Sense of Historical Continuity*—growing appreciation of the movements in human history which reveal the potentialities of life; feeling of belonging to a tradition where men seek for the deepest meanings and highest values of life; recognition of debt to the past for all that enriches and exalts the common life.

*Group Celebration of Values*—growing desire to share in the customs and ceremonies which help to keep first things first; which develop group mindedness in relation to primary ends of life; which cause persons to re-evaluate and to re-integrate experiences; which help to universalize norms and give life a cosmic setting.

As one thinks of religion from this analytical and functional point of view he will see how different people at each age level, and in varied situations, develop different religious personalities and different kinds of expression for their ideas and ideals. Different people show different degrees of each of these constituent elements. One has a confident but humble sense of worth; another has an over aggressive sense of superiority; while another apologizes for his existence. One is socially sensitive in some relations and has blind spots in others. One is artistic in his appreciation of the universe, another scientific, and another naively anthropomorphic. Some develop refined distinctions in the primary values of life, but not all of these are ready to sacrifice certain enjoyments for those of more enduring worth. In each and all of the categories we see how people develop differently. If an educator would deal realistically with people as he finds them, he must first understand them and then plan for fuller growth. Instead of exhorting people in abstract general terms, and trying

<sup>1</sup>Published by the University of Chicago Press, 1947.

to get them to conform to the same conventional customs, the religious educator must diagnose specific needs, and bring influences to bear on the individual or group from whatever resource that seems most profitable and most practicable. He will plan for certain experiences in the home, others in school, others in the church, and others according to the resources available. In his book referred to above the writer has illustrated how at different age levels, experiences are either furthering or hindering the growth of the religious qualities listed herewith. He has shown how a curriculum for the church must be comprehensive, and how the work done there must be supplemented by planned guidance, in many other situations. There is need for conferences and cooperative study, experimentation and conservation of fruitful findings, if effective religious education is to be achieved. Radical changes in points of view and in programs will need to be made in seminaries, in denominational and interdenominational procedures, in local churches, in general education, in the spiritual outreach of people of this country and of other lands. But there are growing points in group organizations and programs everywhere. The possibilities of advance will not be realized by any wholesale preaching or evangelistic crusade, but by a long time program of carefully planned educational procedures.

To provoke thought and to invite discussion of the needed changes in liberal progressive religious education the writer raises the following questions:

1. Does this ten-point functional analysis of religion serve to draw attention to the complex nature of religion, and the need of analysis into constituent factors? Is the assumption correct that religion is pervasive of life, functional in origin, and needs to be identified in its functional aspects? Does this analysis indicate the true nature of what is called religious, or spiritual, and show how it grows?
2. Is the difference between indoctrination and educational process clear? Is a well graded educational process vital to growth in religious ideas, attitudes, and general conduct? Is a well planned educational program more apt to integrate the total experience, and to make religious attainments more significant?
3. Is it desirable to distinguish between means and ends in religious education? Are theology, Bible study, history, worship, church loyalty, and other such interests to be considered as means or ends in the process of making individuals and society religious? To what degree does religious education, as it operates in church, mission field, college, or seminary, concern itself primarily with changes desired in people?
4. What is the peculiar function of the church in our social order? How is it to be determined? Should it vary in different types of community, and in different cultures? To what degree is religious education a primary function of the church? What is involved in a comprehensive program of religious education?
5. How can the church transcend sectarianism and become a unifying agency, inspiring people to function religiously in all phases of their relationships? In what ways may parents, general educators, and people generally in whatever organization to which they belong, further the ends of religious education? Are conferences, institutes, and publications effective in guiding this wider program of religious education?
6. What kinds of curricular materials are most needed to further the ends of religious education as viewed from a liberal progressive standpoint? What available materials might be used if suitable guide sheets were prepared? To what degree should the rich resources of the past and present be used? What special phase should the Bible have in planning such a curriculum?
7. What kinds of methods and techniques are most usable in the church, and for other agencies seeking to further this type of comprehensive program? Consider the relation of objectives and methods used? Consider gradation, and methods at various age levels. What can be done with radio, audio-visual aids, forums, correspondence work, etc.?
8. What place does worship have in religious education? What needs to be done to make a naturalistic point of view in worship services? What creative work



- must be planned for development of ritual, hymns, inspirational literature, and suitable settings for worship? What kind of procedures will be most likely to affect insight and motivation at different age levels, and with people of different backgrounds?
9. How can religious educators keep alert to spiritual crises, to significant pronouncements and actions, to areas of special interest, as people manifest religious or spiritual sensitivity in their varied services for human welfare? What are the growing points for religious values at the present time in public education, in labor movements, in government agencies, in reform activities, and in the many types of humanitarian organizations? What are scientists, psychologists, artists, writers, and others doing that is vital for furtherance of these ends? What is being done that needs correction?
  10. What kinds of organizations and publications can further these interests of liberal progressives? How can individuals make specific contributions? How can mutual stimulation and cooperative achievements be developed? To what degree is the Religious Education Association hopeful, or hopeless, in such a movement?
  11. Can a movement of this kind find allies in other countries so that religious education may function with a world vision, and help to overcome the divisive and tangential nature of most organized religion today? How can the varied forms of spiritual interest be better correlated, and language of common discourse be developed?
  12. Where can we begin so that liberal progressives may find satisfactory outlets for their vision and faith, and so that young people may be challenged to give their lives to this comprehensive work of religious education?

## EVALUATIONS

### I

GEORGE A. COE, Claremont, California  
*Honorary President Religious Education Association*

PROFESSOR CHAVE'S article reminds me of the birth of the Religious Education Association in 1903. An organization of professors who were learned in the Scriptures had brought about a convention for the purpose of seeing what could be done about a situation in which the churches, almost universally, were teaching the young as true what biblical research had proved to be untrue. Other problems—particularly psychological and educational—fused with the biblical issue, and the R.E.A. emerged. It demanded objective truthfulness in the Sunday school as well as in the professor's study!

The keynote of Professor Chave's pronouncement also is truthfulness through the use of empirically ascertainable knowledge. *Aggressive* truthfulness! I am glad that he calls for a yes-or-no response to the broadened naturalism of today which includes, as the naturalism of yesterday did not, the whole of human nature, its ideas and valuations as well as its visible conduct. Religion cer-

tainly has a history that is continuous with pre-history; a psychological structure and a process that are continuous with those of general psychology, and a dynamics that is continuous with the dynamics of society as a whole.

There is solid ground, therefore, under Chave's search for ideas, attitudes, and enterprises that, though ordinarily they are not classified as spiritual, are susceptible of growth towards the ends that are approved by religion at its best. He is on solid ground, also, when he holds that in the fostering of these germs of religion there is no natural dividing line between adults and the young, and that the primary curriculum material for the religious alimentation of both of them is at hand in contemporary experiences of growth and of frustration. Historical material is requisite, it is true, for adequately planned control of these experiences, but when this which is added to our life for the sake of more life is treated as primary, and

our own experience of living as secondary, the word "religious" in "religious education" loses distinction—in the language of the street, it "lacks punch." Chave puts an unerring finger upon the reason why our church schools, even those of liberal type, are drying up. The liveliness of certain reactionary church schools presents no exception to this relation of history to life; rather, their liveliness reflects what seems, to those who practice it, to be a first-hand wrestling with God (or Satan) here and now.

Chave's list of ten functions of religion appears at first sight, to be soothing to the liberal mind; but a second look may be disturbing. For, whereas the list represents only desirable religion, there is undesirable religion also. Even in our country there are faiths that, however noble their origins may have been, are now repressive of some of the functions here listed, and indifferent to others. The seventh—acceptance of empirical inquiry in the totality of experience—is explicitly rejected by some of our religions, and side-stepped by many. In fact, religious authoritarianism has pervaded our national culture from the beginning. It is the taproot of the present confusion in both state education and church education. (This I have discussed in "Religious Authoritarianism in Our National Culture," *Religious Education*, Nov.-Dec., 1947, 321-326.) Religion that is liberal at its roots as well as in some of its fruitage, therefore, is a variant species in our country as well as elsewhere. A collision—to change the figure—is inevitable between really liberal religious education and an entrenched religious tradition. How should a progressive liberal act in this kind of situation? The religious education movement of this century has been characterized, on the whole, by arm-chair dissent from authoritarianism. That this dissent has been ineffective is witnessed by Chave's exposure of existing conditions. What now is required is direct, explicit, active resistance at all age levels. I am not sure that Chave has in mind anything as unconventional as this. A word with regard to the conduct of this conflict is in order.

Liberal religious education must become

a conscious partner in the endeavor, which now centers in the United Nations, to secure for everybody the freedom of the human mind that is contemplated in the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights contains an unusually suggestive formula: "Freedom to hold opinions without interference, and to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers." We live among ecclesiastical frontiers that check movements of religious thought and inquiry almost precisely as political frontiers check movements of civic thought and inquiry. Religious education must "seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers!" This implies facing opposition, and it requires a thought-out method. The groundwork of the only method I can think of that is likely to be effective is this: Let expert religious intelligence and learning be employed against *frankly specified* authoritarian religions, organizations, publications, and individuals (whatever be their names, their history, their prestige) so that our pupils will early form a habit of discrimination; and, as true liberals, let us envelop this frankness in greater courtesy and profounder respect for all persons than authoritarianism ever has evoked from its own principles, or ever can.

Nobody has labored harder than Chave has done to erase the conventional distinction between secular and sacred. More such labor is required, for religious education still is expected to anoint objects—a place of worship, a book, a person, an institution, a set of words—instead of opening pupils' eyes to see what these objects dynamically are. The current idea of the sacred needs a degree of attention that is beyond the scope of Chave's essay and of this comment. But I cannot refrain from noting one feature of the present need. In the controversy over religion in the public schools, and in the general church-state controversy, there is fast and loose play with the notion of the sacred—and the fast-and-loose players are not all on one side. The chief present function of the idea of the sacred seems to be

to assist one or another party to get what it wants without full disclosure of its intentions.

The more I re-read Chave's article, the more I see in it. It goes a long way in the direction of the new life that religion at its best sets over against merely conventional goodness. That crises greater than he describes loom before us need not, therefore, occasion any fault-finding with his article. I, for one, am obliged, however, to view the particular problems of the church school as phases of an inclusive problem that our organized religions do not recognize as religious. A pervasive religious lag is, indeed, acknowledged and bewailed. But the taproot of it is out of sight in what a psychiatrist might call the "unconscious" or "subcon-

scious" of current piety. I refer to the tacit acceptance of a relation of person to person that adversely affects the ethical growth of society; a relation in which material possessions of A are so matched against the relative lack of possessions by B that B obtains for himself and his family food, clothing, and shelter only by labor that adds to the possessions of A. *In this relationship the personality of both A and B is a secondary consideration, yet nearly all organized religion acquiesces in it.* There is, indeed, considerable talk about the ethical inferiority of the profit motive, but private profit making is accepted as normal and every suggestion that it should be ended produces pious shudders. What religious education most needs is religion!

## II

WILLIAM CLAYTON BOWER

*Professor Emeritus, Divinity School, University of Chicago*

I FIND MYSELF in whole-hearted agreement with the general point of view and philosophy which Dr. Chave has expressed in his article. In my opinion, his functional approach to an understanding of religion as a fundamental aspect of man's interaction with his natural, social, and cosmic world is eminently sound. His insistence that the functional relation of religion to personal and social experience should be the basic determinant in the procedures of religious education is a logical sequence of such an understanding of the nature of religion.

As I have pointed out elsewhere, it is of the greatest importance to distinguish between the function of religion in personal and social experience and the theological, liturgical, and institutional structures by which the function of religion is implemented. In a vital religious experience these conceptual, cultic, and ecclesiastical structures change as the experience of the cultural group and its individual participants change, but the integrating and reconstructive function of religion remains constant. The constant danger against which religious education must continually be on guard is that these cumulative

end-products of past religious experience be substituted for the actual experience of the religious values of present experience. In that event, the response is to tradition rather than to reality itself. When this happens, religion ceases to be vital and becomes stereotyped, formal, external, and authoritative, as the eighth century prophets and Jesus so poignantly maintained. "You have nullified what God has said for the sake of what has been handed down to you." (Mt. 15:6).

Out of this substitution of tradition for the spiritual realities of a dynamic current experience has arisen one of the greatest tragedies of contemporary Western culture—the vast chasm that has come between stereotyped orthodox theological thinking and the thought and life of the secular world. Thus modern man's world has been split between the so-called "sacred" and the so-called "secular" in which the one is set against the other in an all-but-irreconcilable opposition. Religion has tended to move from the vital integrating center of all values arising from all the areas of man's interaction with reality to the periphery of his concerns and to become just another specialized and isolated



interest and activity. To the degree that this has happened its roots are severed from the soil of the common life from whence it derives its substantive content and its vital and continuous growth and where God is creatively at work in history. In its isolation religion not only loses its moral and spiritual sensitivity, but its capacity to influence the common life. It becomes as completely secular as isolated science, isolated technology, isolated industry, and isolated politics. As such it becomes a frustrating and disintegrating factor in personal and social living. Meanwhile the creative forces of the modern world with their immense spiritual potential are by-passing stereotyped religion, leaving it behind in its complacent aloofness. Unhappily, the current neo-orthodox movement has deepened and widened this chasm and rendered a solution of the accentuated problem more difficult. An understanding of the functional relation of religion to man's personal and social experience appears to offer the most promising solution thus far proposed for integrating man's whole self and his whole culture into a meaningful, spiritual, and viable unity.

These considerations have received a new importance and urgency in the light of the current wide-spread concern to restore moral and spiritual values in general education. It was stereotyped theological and ecclesiastical religion with its attendant sectarianism in America that led in the nineteenth century to the exclusion of religion from the public schools. Sectarian, theologized religion is no more competent to come to terms with the educational problem now than it was then. Sectarian theology has no place in the public schools, and it is not the business of the schools to teach theology. Only a functional approach which seeks to discover and develop moral and spiritual values potentially inherent in the experience of the school community and the educational process is competent to meet the urgent demands of public education.

Dr. Chave is entirely correct in his insistence that the experiences of the school community be analyzed for their spiritual content. His observation of actual school situations

over a considerable period of time and his analysis of the value-potential of these situations under ten categories constitute a valuable contribution to such a functional approach. The educational value of these categories consists in their use as a stimulus and guide to teachers and pupils in the discovery and identification of the value-potentials of the school community. The danger of any such list is that the categories will be taught as traits were once taught, with the result that the learning process will be short-circuited by the substitution of the categories for the creative discovery and development of these values. This result need not follow, but it must be guarded against by the development of a technique for their creative use. This involves an extremely difficult technical procedure for which teachers must be creatively trained in the use of a creative method where the emphasis is upon learning rather than indoctrination.

The functional approach means that a program for the discovery and development of moral and spiritual values in education should be an integral part of the total school program, rather than another course or department. It should be essentially a matter of emphasis in which administrators, teachers, and pupils will be sensitized to these moral and spiritual values when and where they occur in the normal course of school experience—in the social relations of the school community, in the content of the curriculum, in personal and group counseling, in sports and recreation, and in the relation of the school to the larger community.

Fortunately, the functional approach to this problem has passed beyond the theoretical stage. For example, the Kentucky State Department of Education, in cooperation with the University of Kentucky, the University of Louisville, and the four State Colleges, is developing a Program for the Discovery and Development of Moral and Spiritual Values in Education for the public schools of Kentucky. On the basis of the philosophy outlined above, this program has passed through five steps of procedure. At a state-wide conference of superintendents and teachers held in the University of Ken-

tucky a basic functional philosophy and steps of program development proposed by the Department's committee were unanimously adopted. Six pilot experimental schools were chosen in cooperation with the sponsoring institutions in the various parts of the state. A workshop for the participants in the experimental schools was held in the summer at the University of Kentucky. A conference of the superintendents and principals of the experimental schools with the coordinators from the sponsoring institutions was held at the Department to work out details of procedure. The program entered the experimental stage in the selected schools in the autumn. From this experimental be-

ginning corrections will be made on the initial procedure and directions for the future will be derived from experience in working on the problem.

The time has come for new directions in religious education. Without in any way underestimating the invaluable achievements of the past, there is need for a new orientation to the problem and more vital and more religious procedures for discovering and developing the potential spiritual quality of modern man's interaction with the realities of the natural, social, and cosmic world where God and man meet in the experiences of the common life and the dynamic processes of history in the making.

### III

MRS. MARGUERITE HARMON BRO  
*Cable, Wisconsin*

FOR THE LIFE of me, I cannot see why Mr. Chave directs his article to the liberal progressives because the very group which he sets up by definition as being the liberal progressives are the ones who do not fit his bill of indictments. In opening his argument, however, he does a fine job of giving us three succinct definitions of the terms *liberal*, *progressive*, and *religious education*: then he clarifies his clarity by also telling us what he does not mean by the terms. The reader gathers that the liberal progressive is a still-growing individual with an experimental attitude toward life and that if this kind of individual happens to be interested in religious education, he will put meaning ahead of methods.

So far I agree, but twice in the course of those two opening paragraphs I sat back and chewed my pencil. First, when I wished Mr. Chave had not led out with the phrase, "By religious education we mean a comprehensive program"; one thing I hold against all of "us liberals" is the way we whip out a program wherever two or three are gathered together. Couldn't we sometimes present ourselves idea-first or even mood-first and let our imperatives spread out like a flame

instead of like a logarithm? As soon as I meet up with "trained people working intelligently and cooperatively . . . seeking to make developing moral ideas operative, etc." why, then I tend to go hunt someone who has lost himself and his vocabulary in a big idea. It seems as if almost every gathering of those he calls "professional religionists" is bogged down by programs defined in big cover-all phrases. The second time I chewed my pencil was in waiting for Mr. Chave to make plain what he meant by that other word—religious. At the end of his article I was still not sure. In this connotation it is important to know what the word means. Either religious education does differ from other kinds of education, although it is not exclusive of them, or else there is no use in pinning a separate name on it. In every-day life I thought religious education meant simply the drawing-out of the young (root meaning of *e ducto*) so that they may find their relationship to God and also at the same time to their fellows, young and old. A kind of fostering of growth into the heart of the two great commandments, and in the order they were handed down. Naturally growth goes on in the context of each day's experiences;

nobody can grow in a vacuum; but a formal program is not the important part of the fostering.

The long third paragraph of the article, beginning with the urgent need for radical changes in the teaching of morals and religion, sounds to me like Walter Lippmann twenty-five years ago. To be sure, these accusations still fit some churches and some teachers but it does not seem to me that the year 1950 is any time to shout that "churches have become competing sects, and there is no spirit of unity or common concern for the urgent human needs that demand attention." Where I get around I find a whale of a lot of concern over being a part of a competing sect and church members are in a lather to get together just as fast as they can; not all of them but enough so that the Methodists made the grade and the Congregational-Christians and Evangelical-Reformed have got as far as the law courts while most of the rest of us have feelers out in six directions at once. Of course, I can remember back to the day when it was otherwise and perhaps that is one reason I feel Mr. Chave overshoots his mark. If he looks back a few decades he will be less pessimistic about the state of affairs and begin to follow his own advice to "appreciate the slow growth process by which personalities mature and society attains its higher forms." Neither do I believe that most of the ecumenical movements are sentimental or spend their time saving their vested interests. What makes a movement ecumenical? The over-head committee which calls together official representatives or a worldwide interest in some special concern? It seems to me the world-wide concern for homeless peoples is an ecumenical movement peculiar to our day and markedly liberal and progressive and religious both in intent and program. There are many others; maybe increasing concern for children everywhere is one. And the struggle for meaning which he says characterizes as many persons outside the churches as well as in, is another.

Paragraph four; "This is the day for religious liberals to assert themselves." Isn't that what we have been doing for quite some time — asserting *ourselves*? I often feel that

is one reason more people don't come along with us. We aren't too compelling to rally around. We aren't so much alive with love and afire with justice, for instance, as we are agile in verbalization. Less articulate persons keep still when we start talking but they frequently feel we miss the point of *religious* education. Now here I am taking a crack at the liberals just as Mr. Chave does! Maybe we are both disgusted with ourselves for running all around the barn and forgetting to milk the cow. Liberals aren't any different from other exponents of religion in forgetting to bear down on the central issue which still remains — phrase it as one will — how to find God and make our wills one with his so that strength and joy and peace well up in us as they did in the one we call his son. Recognizing a social and psychological process does not change the central problem.

This whole article puts men in a contradictory frame of mind because I do not believe that liberals are the breed Mr. Chave accuses them of being. Most of the liberals I know do not simplify moral and religious teaching; sometimes I wish they would. Neither do they deal in naive anthropomorphisms; neither do they use religion as an escape to a dream world; nor do they personify the sustaining forces of the world to the exclusion of understanding them. If they did those things, they would not be liberals by Mr. Chave's own definition.

Now when he comes to his ten categories of developing experience, Mr. Chave talks to a definite point although I would want the children I was trying to educate religiously to discover that religion is more than a pervasive quality of living, pervasive though it is! It seems to me that points four, seven, eight and perhaps ten are all steps in the same experience, degrees of correlation of experience, but it is not too important how such phases are enumerated just so they are not overlooked. If the article had been written around these considerations and their amplification in the questions which follow, I should like to have passed it on to a dozen fellow liberals but I see no point in slapping them down first. Also I should have been

equally glad to hand the article to friends who are not exactly liberals but honestly trying to let in some light. In view of the suggested analysis of these functional factors I am persuaded to read Mr. Chave's book, a thing

I have been slow about to my own loss, I know. And I hope the next time we meet he will be feeling very liberal toward a recalcitrant liberal.

## IV

ISRAEL S. CHIPKIN

*Vice President, Jewish Education Committee of N.Y.C. and of the American Ass'n of Jewish Education*

THE THOUGHTS expressed by Dr. Ernest Chave, in his article, "Religious Education for Liberal Progressives" are refreshing as they are challenging. To fundamentalists in any of the established historical church groups, they may even prove shocking. As a matter of fact, these thoughts as expressed are probably a greater indictment of the so-called liberals and progressives than they are of the fundamentalists.

Dr. Chave does well to begin his article with definitions—affirmative and negative—of the concepts, "liberal," "progressive" and "religious education."

As a liberal, progressive thinker, he seeks to tap the spiritual resources in the individual, in society, in nature, and to discover ways to relate them to each other through integrated individual and group experience.

He believes that all human beings have much in common, and that each individual has a divine potential for creative existence. He reposes his faith in the educational process as a means whereby the creative personality of the individual and the creative cultural expression of the group can best be produced.

He is impatient with the liberals who discuss but do not translate their convictions into a plan of action. He demands courage of them and a readiness to accept criticism. He offers them a set of functional criteria by which they can lead the individual and society to understand and to accept the "developmental nature of morals and religion, and avoid the dogmatic, authoritative, supernatural, abstract truths." He reminds them of the "spiritual meanings and values inherent in everyday primary relationships" and warns them against the acceptance of

the "dualism of sacred and secular, natural and supernatural." He summons them to help human beings achieve through daily personal, social-nature relationships a unified philosophy of meaningful values, and to keep "close to the growing knowledge of the processes of life" so that they themselves will remain "in the real world instead of finding in religion an escape to the dream world."

It is not easy to reply to his indictment of existing sectarian Church organizations for their competitive attitude towards each other, and for the apparent lack of a "spirit of unity" or common concern for the urgent human needs that demand attention. He notes that there are non-churchmen who are deeply religious and who try to teach many Christian ideals through non-church agencies. He feels that it is "foolish to try to rationalize any particular doctrine, custom or system that arose in the past and to try to get conformity to it. The results of this kind of teaching is to make religion divisive, sectarian, impotent in a complex world." As against "the divisive and tangential nature of most organized religion today" and instead of "wholesale preaching and evangelistic crusade," he substitutes a "long time program of carefully planned educational procedures" involving all social and religious agencies and the most advanced scientific knowledge concerning individual and group behavior.

These thoughts and sentiments attest to the sincerity, the honesty and the spiritual character of the author. He is indeed a religious man and wants to share his religious values with all his fellow-men. Yet—there will be equally sincere, honest and religious

persons, who might find in all this thesis a "unified philosophy of religious values," but not a specific philosophy of religion or a theology. For them, theology is a source of spiritual anchorage for their beliefs, and tradition is a source of spiritual strength for their moral behavior. Theology and tradition offer them, as individuals and as a group, the sanctions and sanctification of religious values and practices of the real and of the ideal. These people find in theology and tradition historic distinction, self-worth, identification with the exalted and sometimes martyred experiences of their ancestors. They also find in their peculiar theology and tradition, the promise of continued spiritual growth or bliss for their posterity. These are thoughts and sentiments which pure reason or changing scientific facts alone cannot replace.

Of course, there need not be any essential conflict between the sources of religious experience and those of scientific experience. But can the ends sought by Dr. Chave be achieved without reference to the loyalties, the beliefs and the practices of those affiliated with the established historic religions? When he invites the liberal and the progressive religionist to accept a "unified philosophy of religious values," does he wittingly or unwittingly invite him to by-pass existing historic religious systems and organizations? As a realist, he will probably recognize the unreality of inviting the loyal adherents of any existing faith to forsake the same for the sake of a new desirable philosophy. As a liberal and as a progressive, he will not want to deprive others of their sources of faith and spiritual comfort. As a student of the social sciences, he must allow for evolution and historic processes to take their courses. His own practical course must therefore envisage the co-existence and the integration of his "unified philosophy of religious values" with the specific philosophies of historic religions.

Suggestions in this direction have been made by various writers. One of them, Dr. Mordecai M. Kaplan, has advocated the formulation of an American religion, based on the spiritual experiences of the American

people in developing the American tradition of democracy. American history, literature, practices and ideals would constitute the content of this religion and would bind in spirit all American inhabitants. At the same time, each inhabitant would be encouraged to preserve his identification with the historic group or faith into which he was born or with which he has affiliated.

The co-existence of established historic religious systems with Dr. Chave's proposed "unified philosophy of religious values," implies a mutual influence between his "philosophy" and these "systems." Both the "systems" and the "philosophies" must recognize and allow for continuity and change in our social and religious organizations if humanity is to grow and to be guided by eternal or divine values. There is much of stability, continuity, inspiration, idealism, personality and democratic values which the several existing historic religious organizations can contribute to American civilization. On the other hand, the existing religious organizations must recognize "the developmental nature of morals and religion" if they too want to grow with time and new knowledge.

The indictment of divisiveness and backwardness which is made against existing historic religions can be removed by them not only by accepting the "new knowledge," but also by renewing and enforcing for their adherents, the knowledge of their respective religious teachings which were inspired by supreme spiritual experiences. Everyone of these historic religions teaches brotherly love, respect for the life and the dignity of the individual, the recognition of personal rights and group differences, the sacrifice of the materialistic to the spiritual, the banishment of war and injustice in this world.

If existing religious organizations have sinned in our generation, it is not only because of their failure to accept the "new knowledge" but even more so because of their failure to transmit to their respective followers the exalted religious values which are included in their own teachings.

Most of the "religious values" included by



Dr. Chave in his "philosophy" are also professed by the historic religious systems. Because the world is still shackled by hate and misery, there is a feeling of disappointment that historic religious systems have failed to fulfill their historic missions. Even many of their respective adherents feel that the

leaders of these systems have been more concerned with organizational strength than with spiritual achievements.

In the present discussion, the liberal progressive American religionist addresses himself to these historic religious bodies, saying, "to thine own self be true."

## V

STEWART G. COLE

*Executive Director, Pacific Coast Council on Intercultural Relations, Los Angeles, California*

WE MAY look at the subject of religion in a number of ways. For instance, in the light of history, Judaism and Christianity with their sectional subdivisions are familiar to us in this country. In terms of the likenesses of historic religions, we note that they have in common (1) a medium of revelation (scriptures, saviors, miracles, and the like), (2) a type of social organization (temples, churches, holy orders, and the like), (3) a set of convictions and ideals (rules of faith, theologies, beatitudes, and so on), and (4) a program of action (rituals, ceremonies and human-service interests). Their differences, which are pronounced in many particulars, center around the respective ways that their devotees conceive and treat these four kinds of religious data.

In the article we are considering, Chave presents an ethical and psychological approach to religion. His viewpoint is sometimes characterized as that of social idealism. It is patterned after the Rauschenbusch-Ames-Coe tradition in this country. Religion focuses upon personal-social relations, although the importance of man's cosmic inquiry for self and social sustenance (search for God) is not entirely overlooked. The essence of religion is that quality of experience in these associations which enriches the personalities of individuals and raises the level of their common life. Persons may and do share the high meanings and values of life without necessarily depending upon any of the historic religions. The criteria of this functional approach are a sense of worth, social sensitivity, and so on.

This article presents Chave in three roles: as a rebel, a social idealist, and a crusader. He reflects much impatience with the historic conventions of all religions, as witness his criticisms (1) of the traditional impedimenta of second-hand human experience which these faiths impose upon their adherents, and (2) of the social and spiritual deprivation the devotees suffer because they are not free to explore for themselves the "first fruits" of religion. In advancing the cause of social idealism Chave's singleness of interest is indicated in his emphasis upon the supreme worth of human beings, the necessity of their cooperative association, the means of their socio-moral growth, their use of intelligence for problem-solving, and their exercise of every capacity and occasion which can be commanded to elevate the life of man in our time. Chave's enthusiasm for his viewpoint makes him a rather aggressive, somewhat impatient, and a tireless crusader for his cause.

The nub of Chave's viewpoint is contained in his selection of ten criteria of religion, experimentally conceived. Each of them provokes questions that are not easily answered, for the reason that psychologists and ethicists do not always see eye to eye in their separate fields, nor when they compare notes across fields. I shall be content with statements on three criteria, and with a few comments about the setting in which they are rooted.

(1) The most provocative affirmation is number three. This is true because Chave would strip the supreme value of historic

religions, referred to in the symbol "God," of all supernatural trappings and reclothe it in the understandings and appreciations of persons who live in the scientific thought-world of the mid-twentieth century. But men who frankly adopt this "natural" approach disagree in their claims. There are monists and pluralists, mechanics and vitalists, earthly realists and absolute idealists. Where does this leave the teacher of young children? Shall she be content with her favorite theistic platitudes? Shall she omit any cosmic references in her instruction of young boys and girls in this rarefied atmosphere of human values? Or, shall she introduce children to the wide range of audio-visual values of nature and the cosmos, an orientation for which they are increasingly well qualified as growing persons, and leave them to draw their own religious conclusions? If the third position is adopted, which Chave seems to suggest, and the teacher does not wish to become escapist in her religious thought, then she must be prepared for a fundamental rethinking of the whole philosophic structure of the historic religions and of their curricula of religious education.

Three difficult problems face the educator at this point. One has to do with philosophical method. The trends of the natural sciences are predicated upon the hypothesis that the cosmos is mechanistically controlled and is, therefore, subject to scientific inquiry and increasing human understanding. Where does this leave the religionist with his idea of God, and how shall he reconcile his religious inquiry with the viewpoint of science?

The second problem is an ethical issue. Human experience leads us to believe that nature and the cosmos are apparently neutral toward man in some respects, friendly in others, and hostile in still others. These data compel us to ask: Does the cosmos really care for the well-being of man? If so, how effectively? What about the destructive forces of earthquake, famine, drought, pestilence and the like? The problem of cosmic evil is not easily disposed of in reflective human experience.

The third issue centers in the field of pedagogy. Presuming that the teacher of

children has met the first two problems to her satisfaction, how shall she introduce children to the cosmic values of religion, whether we consider the immediate and everyday relations with nature or the more profound convictions that grow out of reflection as to the character of the universe? How primary shall she regard either of them in the scale of religious values? What bearing shall her viewpoint have upon the use of such biblical resources, for instance, as the decalogue, the visions of the prophets, the virgin birth, the authority of Jesus, the apocalypse, and so on. Furthermore, what obligation has she to help children, youth and adults become mature in their ability to meet the problems involved in the cosmic quest for human values?

(2) Chave's viewpoint leaves an educational gap between the historical and psychological approaches to religion as referred to above. He attempts to meet it in his statement of the ninth criteria, but most of his comments covering historic values, institutions, and conventions of the good life are rather critical. Where, for instance, in his article does he deal suggestively with the importance of the "feeling of belonging to a tradition?" We need positive, trail-blazing guidance in religious education as to how to introduce the historic data of the religions to youth, and how to relate them to the primary religious values which persons discover through facing the exigencies of life in our time. Furthermore, what proportion of the time devoted to religious education ought to be given to historical perspective and to the revaluation of traditional values, and what to the ongoing experience of living persons?

(3) This reflection leads on to the seventh affirmation made by Chave. Does a culture-group never "arrive" in its history with a core of values that becomes its basic rallying interest? Cannot the fact that it does arrive be validated repeatedly in the psychological study of social and religious movements? Take, for example, communism or democracy. Each of these "ways of life" holds to a code of fundamental values. They serve to give their respective exponents a clear sense of corporate direction, a feeling

of rapport among the members, and specific causes to champion. While these value-systems are fluid, they change rather slowly. What about the values of Judaism and Christianity, of Protestantism and Catholicism, of parents and citizens in a democracy? From Chave's viewpoint, what constitutes a fit "religious (rather than theological) creed" for the educator that would be comparable to the American Creed of democracy? What bearing would the educator concede that such a working group-code had to the free inquiry of the individual members of the group?

(4) A word is in order about the critical method that Chave used in arriving at his set of criteria. He has asserted that they are experientially conceived and interpreted. If so, what frame of reference entered into the selection and the shaping of the affirmations? Certainly one may assume the frame is neither pre-scientific nor anti-democratic in structure. Obviously, it is in the pragmatic, American strain, with due regard for certain psychological restraints resting upon teachers who would lead children and youth to freely enrich their own growing, dynamic personalities in the society that America affords. It is my impression that Chave has laid more emphasis upon the subjective aspect of the

child's personality in determining his norms than he has upon the objective aspect, which is the American culture in which the child seeks and finds his personal-social relationships. The traits of American culture are many, and powerfully conditioning in shaping the experience of the child, including his "religious" orientation. Some of them "unite" Americans; others spread disunity at home and abroad in the world. The question as to what kind of citizenship we need to cherish in fulfilling the responsibilities and the privileges of living in these tragic but hopeful times, would, if seriously considered, have an important bearing upon the selection of particular religious norms for education.

But it will bear repetition to say that a healthy religion will never be content with a mundane, human focus, however inclusive of the highest hopes of the cultures of mankind. Religion also deals with the great persistent and climactic problems of life and death, personal defeat and achievement, human conflict and world peace, in their cosmic setting. To affirm that man's destiny rests with himself is only a partial truth. The forces of the natural world and of nature's God have something not entirely inconsequential to do with it.

## VI

GAINES S. DOBBINS

*Professor of Religious Education, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky*

THE PROGRESSIVE conservative welcomes free inquiry, continuously seeks improvement experimentally, is keenly concerned for human betterment, is quite aware that advance depends humanly on competent teachers and officers of the church school utilizing the best available methods and materials, and is unhesitatingly willing to submit outcomes to the test, "By their fruits shall ye know them."

By conservative we do not mean narrow, literalistic, backward, intolerant, self satisfied, suspicious of all who disagree. By Christian religious education we do not mean the mere transmission of biblical facts and

doctrinal systems to passive listeners. Stereotyped, outworn patterns of Sunday school work we seek to replace through a program of unceasing insistence on modernization of both methods and means. Through ever-enlarging activities we try to make the whole church a school, its every activity intended to provide fruitful learning experiences — worship, preaching, teaching, training, giving, serving, evangelizing, socializing, and all else, integrated by the concept of the church as a Christian educational institution.

We feel that the "liberal" has nothing of positive value that we do not claim. But we see in the omissions, attitudes, conten-



tions, and practices of those who pride themselves on being liberals, forces that will weaken if not ultimately destroy the educational program to which both liberals and conservatives are committed.

The most distressingly significant omission is that of recognition of the uniqueness and centrality of Jesus Christ. The conservative stands for the conservation of values and sees in the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith religious education's supreme value. Saving power, we believe, does not inhere in "religion," but in a relationship to God through Christ. Let this conviction be lost, the conservative is assured, and religious education loses its attractiveness and dynamic. The New Testament gives us not only a trustworthy system of ethics but also a divine Saviour, vital union with him being the great objective of all teaching and learning. As highly desirable and valuable as are social and character outcomes, they are fruits of this tree of Christian faith which nurture may plant and cultivate but which nurture can neither create nor do without. Religious education that is not faithfully Christian, we conservatives believe, is incapable of meeting life's needs today.

Certain attitudes of so-called liberals distress the progressive conservative. The Sunday school had a humble beginning and still has many inadequacies, but it is far from decadent. Indeed, in a multitude of progressive and aggressive churches it is a "Sunday" school in name only, its activities extending through the week and into many areas of life. In addition to the Sunday school as a teaching agency, wide-awake churches provide programs of leadership and membership training, of missionary information and inspiration, of Christian witness and service, of family worship and enrichment. There are many underprivileged churches with poverty-stricken educational programs, to be sure; but that the vigorous and successful programs of a multitude of conservative churches should be characterized as failures is gratuitous and unfortunate. We conservatives are convinced that intelligent teaching of the truths of the Bible does not consist of "abstract ideologies," "technical jargons," the

adding of "strange beliefs and customs to overcrowded and confused lives"; rather, that this is the most effective approach in aiding growing persons to "appreciate the multiple possibilities in the common life, the alternatives of good and evil, the essential conditions for significant achievements in personal-social living." We hold that the facts do not warrant the assumption of superiority of naturalism over supernaturalism in producing unified, spiritually sensitive, and socially effective lives.

Not one of Dr. Chave's ten objectives would be rejected by the progressive Christian educator. We conservatives are as vitally interested as any liberals in answering progressively and fruitfully the questions raised concerning needed changes. Neither liberal nor conservative has all the answers to these manifold needs. What we conservatives insist on is that the answers will not be found by any of us apart from reverent acceptance of the spiritual authority of Jesus Christ and an intelligent understanding and application of the truths of the Old and New Testament scriptures. This position we hold for at least two reasons: first, it provides the dynamic of a living faith; second, it actually works best in practice.

Professor Chave deplors the lack of fundamental convictions and evidences of moral fibre on the part of liberals and pleads with them to rally around the flag of progressive liberalism. He indignantly castigates liberals who compromise in order to please the uncritical public. Is it not possible that thoughtful students of the problem have come to recognize that neither extreme liberalism nor fundamentalism is tenable, but that functional religious education lies somewhere between, that is, in the position of the progressive conservative? A Christless, Bibleless, naturalistic religious education can no more stir enthusiasm and devotion than a harsh, content-centered, lifeless, intolerant fundamentalism. Must it be "either . . . or?" The liberal needs humility of spirit to admit the limitations of human wisdom and to recognize in Christ "the power of God and the wisdom of God." The fundamentalist needs grace and insight to accept

new light, new approaches, new methods, new viewpoints, new objectives. Together we ought to face the tragic facts and conse-

quences of sin and seek to bring the New Testament answer through the best possible means.

## VII

FRANK and MILDRED EAKIN  
*Madison, N. J.*

IN A CHURCH-SCHOOL session the other day Roy, a fourth-grader, told a story about an American prisoner of war who gained release in answer to prayer. Tom, another member of the group, commented, "It could have been pure coincidence." Later, when the point had been made that Jews and Christians are alike in that both believe in God, and Tom asked, "Is there a God? I often wonder about that," Roy quickly came back with, "Of course there is a God."

Heretofore the pupil of Roy's type has fitted readily into our Protestant Sunday-school scheme of things; Tom's kind has been a source of embarrassment. If and when Sunday school is reoriented in such ways as Professor Chave's philosophy of religious education indicates, this will be changed. Tom's doubt as to prayer being a magic worker, his finding in the God concept a stimulus to probing into the deeper nature of things rather than a formula for superficial assurance—these and similar pupil reactions will be welcomed by the teacher as assets, not frowned upon as barriers.

We have to remind ourselves, however, that religious education as Chave envisions it goes far beyond Sunday school. In fact the philosophy of the ten categories, arrived at by scientific dealing with particulars, is no whit behind traditional theology in comprehensiveness, all-inclusiveness. And a question arises at this point. When thus conceived does not religion tend to take on an unprofitable expansiveness? When the attempt is made to analyze after the scientific manner and at the same time to keep all-inclusiveness in view after the traditional theological and philosophical manner, does not this have the effect of presenting religious education with a field so vast that de-

limiting lines have to be drawn before discussion of programs can promise usefulness?

What kind of delimiting lines? Institutional, organizational? Shall we break down Chave's question, "Where can we begin . . .?" into Where can we begin in Sunday school, in the Sunday morning services, in the theological seminaries? Where can we begin in homes, in community service organizations, in chambers of commerce? Where can we begin in the public schools, in the colleges, in the adult education movement, in the P.T.A.'s? Where can we begin in labor unions, in the press, the movies, the radio and television? No doubt beginnings should be made, can be made, to some extent have been made, in these and other areas of present-day American effort toward growth, toward attaining greater fullness of life. And wherever work toward such great objectives as Chave has in view is contemplated or under way his ten-point functional analysis should be immensely helpful.

But let none of us be deceived—as Professor Chave certainly is not deceived—as to what is happening to the terms religion and religious education when we use them in this way. They become as comprehensive as life itself, man's life and the life of the environing cosmos, but their comprehensiveness has at the same time freed itself from traditional religion's sense of finality, of certainty, of having *arrived*. And in the religious enterprise thus conceived our churches, however much improved over their present state, will at most be sharers in the vast educational effort. There is a good chance that they will be minor rather than major sharers, though by the mercy of heaven—and desperate measures on our part as leaders toward practicing in church attitudes and relationships the humility and cooperativeness

we have so long preached—a great field of coordinating leadership may be occupied by some of them.

Where can we begin? Maybe the question should be changed to Where can we take hold? For in any and all of the institutional or organizational areas mentioned, the leader who sets out to use Chave's functional approach will not be really a beginner. There will be no *tabula rasa* on which he can write. Rather his tool will need to be in the nature of an entering wedge. Other work than his, for worse and for better, will have left its impress.

In Sunday school he will have to reckon with an entrenched biblicism, in the morning church service with a long cultivated attitude of complacent passivity, in colleges and seminaries with an assumption that courses of study which make the Christian gospel obscure and ponderous are necessary for its understanding and propagation, in chambers of commerce with a very human disposition to hold on to special privilege, in labor unions with a similar inability to see that what helps people and society in the large may in the long run be of greatest help to one's particular group. And so forth. How, in one or another of these areas, can one take hold? What particular measure or emphasis is likely to provide the best entering wedge? Happily the leader can be fairly confident that something of the favorable as well as the unfavorable is present in his situation.

In the local church-school field, for example, a degree of progress has been made toward seeing Bible and sacraments and the concepts of theology not as ends but as means toward such ends as the growth of persons in righteousness and mercy and love. Another short distance has been travelled toward translating righteousness into fairness, mercy and love into considerateness and helpfulness. In brief our institutional religion, while not at all oriented in such directions as are indicated in Chave's ten categories, nevertheless does provide important points of contact with them; Sunday school's heritage does equip it with an entering wedge.

Nor is this all. The gregariousness of children—of adults too, for that matter—provides an advance receptiveness to Chave's kind of religious-education effort. It gives the teacher a *group*. Very likely the group has inner cleavages, and at the same time something of class exclusiveness. No doubt the bond of unity that holds the group together is far from what is to be desired. What does this mean? One thing it means is that the group can be a laboratory for the development of maturing persons. It can be so used once the leader takes such development as his goal and comes to see what valuable raw material for his use is at hand in the get-together urge.

Children's curiosity, their exploring urge, is another driving force ready at hand. Among other things they like to explore churches, synagogues. This can lead to a broadened acquaintance with the "different," can accelerate a child's progress away from an egocentric outlook toward social-minded maturity. Again, there is the child's proneness to a *wondering* that moves out beyond self and other selves, his sense of in some way *belonging* in the non-human as well as the human environment. Conventional religion's way of nourishing and guiding this wondering and this sense of belonging is clearly abortive, but they can be nourished and guided. A prime requisite is to avoid glib answers, see the harm that can be done by premature syntheses, shun the lure of delusive certainties, help the child, while keeping alive the questing spirit, to make the best that man has learned his own.

So much for illustration in a single area. Now to look again for a moment at the broader field. When we define religious education as Chave defines it, and then proceed to discuss the promotion of such education mainly in terms of what our church agencies can do, are we perhaps keeping the buggy too much before our eyes as we try to design our automobile? Suppose we had Chave's picture of the nature and goals of the enterprise in mind, while having had no knowledge of or experience with the usual church interests and activities, what kind of religious education would our plan-

ning yield? We cannot know. And it is seldom practicable—probably seldom wise—to make a clean sweep of the worse in preparation for introducing the better. But it need not on that account be idle to raise such questions as have just been raised. They can stimulate our imaginations. If enough

of us in church leadership think often enough of what it would be like were our total enterprise guided by a post-Renaissance instead of a pre-Renaissance philosophy, something may happen. At least progress may be accelerated. And more of us will think of this more by reason of Chave's work.

## VIII

LEON FRAM

*Rabbi, Temple Israel, Detroit, Michigan*

ALL THE LIBERAL Progressive men and women whom Ernest J. Chave addresses, both in his book, *A Functional Approach to Religious Education*, and in his article, "Religious Education for Liberal Progressives," will readily agree both with his premises, with the ten categories which he outlines, and with the experimental curriculum he offers.

The twelve questions which he asks at the end of the article supply their own answers. No one but a Liberal Progressive would ask these questions and on the whole, the members of the group so defined agree upon the answers.

What Dr. Chave accomplishes is to establish in the field of religious education a "progressive education" minority, similar to the minority group devoted to progressive aims and methods in the field of general education. I regard this as a definite achievement, and I believe that the Religious Education Association can find its proper function as such a minority in such an exposed advanced position. Its position, to use Dr. Chave's language, is "hopeful" rather than "hopeless."

As in the case of a progressive experimental group in any field, it will be subjected to charges of being visionary and there may even be some fun poked at it, but that has always been the price of belonging to an ambitious and determined minority group.

Dr. Chave anticipates every possible obstacle to the implementation of his philosophy of religious education. Most religious schools are concentrated upon the teaching of survival values. The religious school is geared to guide the child toward member-

ship in a particular church of a particular denomination. In their anxiety to assure the survival and growth of the particular congregation, the minister and religious educator comfort themselves with the rationalization that education for membership in the church will automatically result also in education for the moral and spiritual values which religion represents.

At the moment, only a small group can be expected to understand that it is only as we succeed in teaching the "sense of worth," "discrimination in values," and "co-operative fellowship" that we assure the survival and expansion of religion as a whole and therefore also the increased strength of the individual congregation.

We have the same situation in the economic world. The small minority of scientific economists knows that prosperity can only come through increased production. Yet the average businessman operates under the delusion that he assures his own prosperity through higher prices based on curtailed production. We need a kind of "economics of abundance" in the field of religious education.

Dr. Chave's program will be resisted just as progressive methods in the general education field have been resisted. Nevertheless, as long as there is an organized group alive and functioning which continues exploration and experimentation, its influence is bound to penetrate. Progressive ideas have a way of infiltrating and transforming even strongly entrenched positions.

We know that it is only as our religious institutions produce men and women who will contribute actively to the spiritualization of our current social life that these in-

stitutions will achieve a real function in the modern world and exert a genuine influence in the great decisions which lie before mankind.

Knowing this to be true, let our small

group of Liberal Progressives in religious education organize itself in the confidence that although it will remain for a long time in the minority, the truth it represents will inevitably prevail.

## IX

SOLOMON B. FREEHOF

*Rabbi, Rodef Shalom Temple, Pittsburgh, Pa.*

AS DR. CHAVE'S two opening paragraphs reveal, the article has a positive and a negative side; but the negative side goes a little deeper than his second paragraph indicates. What, for example, does he mean by "The deities of the theologians are unable to function"? This is almost a direct quotation from Deutero-Isaiah, attacking the idols of the nations. But is this a fair description of Christianity? Why this imputation of outworn pagan polytheism? Why does he speak of "vainly calling on an imaginary deity for supernatural intervention"? It is quite a lot to say in one half of a sentence: that God, to whom we have hitherto prayed, is imaginary, that the help we want would violate nature, and that our prayers to Him in any case are vain, also "If God is to be kept as the name for the integrating qualities, etc." Evidently he doubts that "the integrating qualities," etc., can properly be called God.

At all events, the negative mood of the article seems to grow from some previous quarrels with preachers. Perhaps the animus

revealed in these phrases is not a good preparation for evaluating past religious education. Yet, it may be a good preparation for searching out a new path. The new path or the positive side of the article develops a direction and a test for religious education: namely, that a sense of unity, an integration with the world and the universe, constitutes good religious education. This is an important emphasis and a significant test of achievement. The same test of character seemed important to the Prophet Micah when he said, "What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God." Dr. Chave's article, in effect, describes religious education as a development of Micah's definition plus a few deprecatory remarks directed at God.

It would seem to me that the positive, progressive, integrating religious education which Dr. Chave so greatly and convincingly advocates can be developed without the negativism which seems to be part of his point of view, or at least of his mood.

## X

EMANUEL GAMORAN

*Commission on Jewish Education, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Cincinnati, Ohio*

ALL SINCERE thinkers and workers in the field of religious education will welcome Professor Chave's forthright analysis of the meaning of progressive religious education, with its emphasis on the idea of growth, on the idea of experimenting toward human betterment, and on the thought that religious education should involve intelligent, trained people working to make ideas and ideals function in social life. The

division of the world into the supernatural and the natural is part of our major problem. Certainly at a time when men and women in all walks of life seem to work to improve life, it is the duty of the religionists to find a language of common discourse with them and contribute their share to the improvement of society.

Instead, what do we actually find? We find some of our churches seeking to attach



religious education as an addendum to the education of the state. One hour a week; two hours a week; what a mockery of religious education this movement is! And one church seeks to prevent federal aid to education unless it can, as the price of its approval, drive a wedge into the democratic principle of the separation of church and state. If it fails to succeed in that, that church will not allow the nation to help those poor people who are sadly in need of help in order to secure the minima of a general education for their children.

The statement of Dr. Chave, "They should not be satisfied to accept the frequent dualism of sacred and secular, of natural and supernatural, but should seek a unified philosophy of meaningful values" will find universal approval in the ranks of liberal-minded Jews devoted to Jewish religious education. For if there is anything at all that Judaism emphasizes it is the sanctification of life. Life is not a dualism. It, itself, is to be continuously raised to higher levels. It is all divine and it is to be treated as a unity. Liberals should accept the unity of life and therefore seek to achieve integration in education. They must assume the burden imposed on those who are concerned with the future of humanity, who wish to help human beings to change themselves for the better.

If they recognize the central thought that man is dependent on powers greater than himself—upon "personality-produced creative forces" they will cease to believe that you can teach the idea of God by mere repetition. They will teach the young to evaluate their own experiences, to appreciate the processes of growth, the development of values such as justice and mercy in the world. The religious educator will learn to make the religious way *concrete*. The pupils must know what we mean by spirituality and spiritual attainments instead of using these as mere phrases to secure a sort of aura of amiability which too often passes for spirituality. Such amiability becomes hypocrisy when it is not translated into life.

Dr. Chave lists ten categories which, for him, are descriptive of the religious way, of spiritual attainments. Readers of RELI-

GIUS EDUCATION will see in these a significant analysis of the constituents of religion functionally conceived, even though they may not agree with all its details. For example, to me one of the major difficulties with the analysis is to be found in the sixth category, "Cooperative Fellowship." All will agree with the importance of cooperation, but what about the "appreciation of the Christian ideals in the Kingdom of God?" If Dr. Chave is using the word "Christian" as an evocative phrase, as an adjective of approval similar to our use of the word "Jewish" most people will agree. If, however, the word "Christian" is used descriptively, then he must allow not only for appreciation but also for critical appraisal. To give one example which is too often overlooked: The Christian idea not to resist evil must be subject to critical evaluation. From the Jewish point of view it is incumbent upon all religious ethical men to resist evil. Evil must be fought and overcome. Indeed, I rather assume that the eighth category listed, namely, "Integration of Experience Into a Working Philosophy" with its consideration of the experiences of suffering and happiness, of justice and injustice, of good and evil, implies such a critical approach—even makes it mandatory.

We can all agree that there is little value in exhorting people in abstract terms and in getting them to "conform to the same conventional customs" and we must diagnose specific needs and apply our best resources to the individual and the group in the light of such needs. There is place indeed for significant changes and for careful educational programing.

Now what about the answers to Dr. Chave's questions at the end of his article? An essay could be written as a reply to each of them. However, due to limitations of space we may state the following as a starting point: It would seem that such a functional approach to religious education would not exclude the public school, would not see the public school as a secular undertaking, but would rather conceive of it as the finest embodiment of the common faith of all groups. When the public school so conducts its edu-

cation that it emphasizes social sensitivity, discrimination in values, cooperation, and the quest of truth, it is performing a significant religious function, and only those who wish to construe religion very narrowly will consider it secular. It is not necessary to bring sectarian teaching into the school, it is even unnecessary to use the state as a prop to bolster up religious education in order to make it of significant spiritual value. It is a question of the point of view from which we conduct our public education, and if that point of view is well grounded in the democratic philosophy of life, the education we shall achieve will be religious.

On the other hand there are specific values which the church must emphasize. The church and synagogue have the advantage that their education is conducted in terms of the experience of the religion and culture of the intimate groups. The family, the religious historical group, play an important part in their program. If instead of seeing itself as a mere transmitter of tradition the church will see its task in relation to life it will achieve a greater spirituality; it will indeed be engaging in religious education of a higher sort. Customs and ceremonies transmitted by religious agencies will cease to be merely conventional and will become the means of identifying the individual not only with the significant experiences of the group, but also with the spiritual ideals of mankind. To quote one example familiar both to Jews and non-Jews: The Passover ceremony which, in its Seder (the so-called Last Supper was, as is well known, the Seder ceremony) emphasizes in cultural and esthetic detail the exodus from Egypt, stresses the ideal of freedom. To perform that ceremony effectively is not to engage in mere sentimental verbiage nor to indulge in a mere conventional custom. It is a means of identifying the individual and the group with a great universal idea of historic

spiritual worth. We may, incidentally, thus answer Dr. Chave's question about means and ends. Means well chosen become sanctified, become ends in themselves, but if they are to be so, the ends which they envisage must not be merely implicit, they must be rather explicit. They must be clear to all—above all, to the children we teach. In other words, religious education should always remember that it is teaching not subjects, but children.

Readers of RELIGIOUS EDUCATION will forgive me if I take occasion at this point to emphasize that our Christian friends here have a genuine opportunity to learn something from Jewish tradition. About 100,000 Jewish children in this country are receiving their religious education not in a one-day-a-week school but by attending sessions several times a week; not only on Sunday morning, but also in the afternoons of week days after public school hours. And those thousands of Jewish children who are now only receiving one-day-a-week education tend to increase their hours of instruction either by the addition of time on Sunday or by supplementing the Sunday instruction with at least one or two afternoons in the middle of the week. The volunteer teacher has been practically eliminated from Jewish education. Both of these factors—intensive Jewish education and professional teaching—accompanied by adequate professional training are of the greatest importance, but most important of all in our opinion is that religious educators should take their own professions of faith seriously. If religious education is not to be considered the sectarian affair that most modern people are seeking to get away from, then we ourselves as religious educators must cease to be satisfied with the mere repetition of ancient formulae, must recognize the value of growth, the value of experimentation, and must put our emphasis on the improvement and enhancement of human life.

## XI

NEVIN C. HARNER

*Professor of Religious Education, Lancaster Theological Seminary, Lancaster, Penn.*

I AM GRATEFUL for the privilege of reviewing Dr. Chave's able and thoughtful article. It contains much with which I can agree heartily. His insistence upon a religion that shall actually function in life; his protest against the false dichotomy between the sacred and the secular; his clear call for sympathetic attention to living, growing persons; his helpful analysis of the growth-process in terms of the ten experience-categories which have now become inseparably linked with his name; his rigorous emphasis upon the necessity of translating moral insights and principles into highly specific terms relevant to day-by-day happenings; his forthright challenge to liberals to be as clear and positive in their formulations as conservatives are in theirs—all of these evoke a warm and sympathetic response.

But there are other points at which some must find themselves in fundamental disagreement with the position enunciated in this article. I take it that the purpose of this symposium is precisely to lift out these points of issue for frank and friendly consideration. I shall enumerate four, and attempt to develop them briefly.

1. *The assumption that liberalism and naturalism are virtually synonymous terms.* This assumption is nowhere stated in so many words, but it is—I think—implicit in the article.

Dr. Chave begins by defining "liberal" as meaning "open-minded to free inquiry in all phases of religion." Thus defined, the word connotes a process, a mode of approach to reality, rather than any definite conclusion or outcome of the process. However, he then proceeds to espouse an avowedly naturalistic position, and to characterize unfavorably alternate and opposing conclusions. For example, he speaks of "traditional propaganda techniques," and "outgrown concepts and institutions." He says, "Pre-scientific concepts control most of the language and conventional expressions of religion"; and, "the deities of the theologians are unable to function in the total world." (Conceivably, the

Deity whom all theologians attempt to comprehend may actually be functioning in the total world all the while, no matter how well or how poorly we conceive him.)

Now there are some of us who would claim to be "liberal" in the sense of being free to follow truth wherever it leads us, but who do not come out at the naturalistic position at all. Are we necessarily mistaken in the conclusions which we reach? Or are we self-minded in thinking that we are free to conduct open-minded inquiry, whereas all the while we are merely rationalizing prejudgments adopted and held on emotional grounds?

2. *The reduction of God to a "name for the integrating qualities of our universe which support personal-social values."*

The word "reduction" is used deliberately, because to the personal theist the naturalist identification of God with process seems to reduce him below the level of the human and even below the level of the animal. So far as we can judge, even the higher animals possess some degree of self-awareness and self-direction. A process possesses neither of these attributes.

As has doubtless been pointed out too often, the naturalist conception of deity follows somewhat the same procedure as the now outmoded behaviorist conception of humanity. First, the higher ranges of being are discounted or denied, because they are admittedly difficult to picture and comprehend. Then the remainder is offered as a simple and plausible conception of the reality in question. But does it tell the whole truth?

Dr. Chave says: "To personify the creative, sustaining forces of our universe, is not to understand them." This is, of course, true. But the obverse is equally true; namely, to decline to personify these forces is not to understand them. In either case they are tinged with mystery. And to some of us the mystery is, if anything, all the greater when they are left ungrounded and unrooted in a personal God. Frankly, we find the hypothesis that God is a Person more satisfying both



intellectually and religiously than the naturalist alternative. In so doing, are we pre-scientific or unscientific?

3. *The minimizing of the intractable, selfish, sinful elements in human nature.*

The ten "categories of developing experiences," which to me contain much that is decidedly helpful and welcome, represent on the whole an optimistic view of human nature. They have nothing explicit to say concerning sin, failure, defeat, or tragedy. To be sure, Dr. Chave's development goes on to point out: "Different people show different degrees of each of these constituent elements." But the total treatment does not do adequate justice to the bitter facts of personal and social breakdown. In this respect, it departs both from the classical Christian anthropology and also from the basic insights of modern depth-psychology.

This distinctive conception of man is a logical corollary of the naturalistic conception of God. For naturalism is the end-result of a consistent and one-sided emphasis upon God's immanence, which always eventuates in a portrait of human nature making its way precariously but irresistibly onward and upward. (By the same token, a one-sided stress upon God's transcendence, as in the case of unrelieved neo-orthodoxy, inevitably involves a pessimistic view of man's desperate plight.) What would seem to be required by the facts is neither the extreme optimism of the one nor the extreme pessimism of the other, but a balanced realism which affirms in the same breath that man is a child of God and a sinner.

4. *The virtual elimination of Jesus from the religious and educational scene.*

There is no mention of Jesus in Dr. Chave's article. "Christian" and "Christianity" are there, but neither "Jesus" nor

"Christ." In all major respects, the article would fit equally well into the frameworks of the liberal wings of Jewish, Moslem, Hindu, or Confucianist cultures.

Many educators, including the writer of these comments, stand openly and unashamedly within the Christian tradition. We find in Jesus of Nazareth the focal point of our thinking, our believing, our acting, and our teaching. In him we catch our clearest glimpse of what God is like, our surest understanding of what man is and can be, and our best discernment of the meaning of human history. All of this—it should be noted—can be maintained without any foregone conclusions concerning the pre-existence of Jesus, nor the manner of his entrance upon his earthly career, nor the miraculous concomitants reported of his life and death. It is a value-judgment, an affirmation of worth and meaning, which has been shared by the Christian community for more than nineteen centuries. Is it a mistaken judgment? Is it a valiant but anachronistic attempt to perpetuate the faith of the fathers? Or might it perchance be true?

In conclusion, it will be observed that this critique does not concern itself with the methodology suggested in Dr. Chave's article, but rather with the fundamental presuppositions on which it rests. Granted the validity of these presuppositions, the methodology is sound and consistent—and some of it remains usable, even when superimposed upon another philosophical or theological base. But are the fundamental presuppositions true? Are they more plausible, more scientific, more consonant with the evidence, more likely to function well in human growth and experience than certain alternative presuppositions? This is the basic question raised by Dr. Chave's presentation.

## XII

HUGH HARTSHORNE

*Department of Research, The Divinity School, Yale University*

I FIND MYSELF in general agreement with Dr. Chave's exposition and therefore have little of importance to say. To be sure,

I think he has not followed out the full implications of his position, or perhaps, better, has omitted two or three features that seem

to me essential. But one can hardly state a complete picture of a philosophy of education in a short article.

Before indicating these, to me, important omissions, I might comment on the author's distaste for theology. Are there no liberal and progressive theologians? There are theologies, to be sure, which may deserve his castigations, but not all theology entertains impossible beliefs in an "imaginary deity" or "vainly calls" on such "for supernatural intervention." It is difficult to determine from the article whether Dr. Chave's deity—and he seems to have one—is also imaginary, and whether he or it is to be regarded as integral to his liberal position.

Immediate experience of God is not implied in his position, so that God, if included, would seem to emerge upon reflection, but there is little place for critical reflection, which the author seems to regard as peculiarly futile.

As a substitute for belief in God, or critical reflection of a systematic sort, there is indicated a need for "a unified philosophy of meaningful values." There is much contemporary theology that seems to have this as one of its major concerns, so I should think it would be helpful to seek alliance with this movement rather than to imply that theology in general is irrelevant to the needs of the individual or society.

Incidentally it would be interesting to inquire into the sources of inspiration of those numerous secular leaders who support the non-ecclesiastical organizations which reveal "spiritual interests and constructive activities." I was under the impression that a considerable proportion of them were the products of one or another form of traditional religion, and that on the whole their activities do not succeed much, if any, better than those of the traditionalists in "affecting standards and practices of personal-social living."

This general ineffectiveness might indeed be corrected if all who are concerned with personal-social living should adopt Dr. Chave's analysis, but at this point I should like to expand his proposals. They seem excellent to me as far as they go. He calls his

analysis "functional." While I have little interest in terms like "liberal" and "progressive," or even "functional," nevertheless if these are used they should all be defined, as the author did define the first two. The third key term, however, is left undeveloped, which is perhaps the reason why the whole program seems to me to lack functional significance. This is suggested by the tendency to limit the objectives listed under the ten categories to "appreciation," "recognition," "discovery," "insight," "knowledge," "understanding," as may quickly be noted by glancing through them. Behavior and the concrete realities of actual relationships seem to be omitted. The result might well be an incomplete inner integration and a truncated outer integration. The program thus tends to be individualistic and intellectualistic as well as non-functional in any thoroughgoing way.

One other apparent limitation is the absence of recognition of deep-lying motivations and the experiences through which they are developed. There is little provision here for the development of wholesome techniques or fruitful concepts in the meeting of life's inevitable defeats and frustrations, or for the correction of the unworkable mechanisms which so often result from much early childhood training. In other words, the program is rather extraordinarily free from the influence of any of the various schools of psychoanalytic psychology. Perhaps this omission accounts for the absence of any recognition of the religious and educational problem of sin or of the procedures required for dealing with sin, whether individual or social. That much traditional religion has misconceived this problem may be conceded, but to imply that the growth of the self toward maturity and life in maturity do not involve frequent distortions of one's system of values and frequent disruptions of fellowship, with the repeated need of restoration, is unrealistic to say the least.

I am not at all sure that these alleged omissions are not merely the result of the brevity of Dr. Chave's exposition. Some of his questions at the end of his article seem to imply a much more comprehensive theory

than is expounded in the first part of the paper. The first question, however, I should wish to answer in the negative. The second may be answered in the affirmative without further study. Many of the remaining questions are answered in the author's presuppositions and would be answered differently if the presuppositions were different. It would be useful to try to frame for study and discussion questions which individuals with differing presuppositions could fruitfully

explore. Or perhaps there aren't any. In that case, it would be necessary to make the varying presuppositions explicit and to try to frame questions regarding them which could be either fruitfully argued or which could be answered by a reexamination of data or the discovery of fresh facts. We need to learn how to do *together* the educational jobs that confront us. We are not likely to make even a liberal progressive view prevail by merely asserting its finality.

### XIII

C. IVAR HELLSTROM

*Minister, Riverside Church, New York City*

DR. CHAVE presents us with a very inclusive concept of religious education. He also voices an impatience many of us feel with the agencies and leaders of organized religion. I do not know if he intended to contrast an ideal kind of religious education with what is actually being done in its name, but the effect of his article on me was to deepen my awareness of the gulf between the two and to set me wondering what should be done about it.

Of course the Protestant Churches with all their obvious weaknesses are much more than competing sects. And the Ecumenical Movement is an essential attempt to overcome the sectarian character of our churches. It cannot be brushed aside even though progress from many points of view seems negligible and too much emphasis put upon matters that seem to many people secondary, if not irrelevant. But even in a local church, ideologies, budgets and vested interests (not to speak of clashing personalities) have to be taken seriously. And when problems of labor education, health or government, as well as those of religion, are to be dealt with on a national or international basis, they become very involved and inclusive movements make discouragingly slow progress.

There is a fairly large number of men and women working in churches and synagogues, in organizations like the Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A., in religious work on college campuses and in teaching religion in schools, colleges and seminaries who are easily iden-

tified as "religious educators." It is about the status of these people that we are periodically concerned. It is in relation to their work that we have been accustomed to discuss the problems, the curriculum, etc. of religious education. Are we now to assume that there is a considerable number of them who are to be thought of as the "liberals and progressives" or that most "liberals and progressives" are outside of the churches, synagogues and their related institutions? To the insiders the questions raised at the end of the article are nothing new but of perennial interest.

It is often difficult for strong, clear-cut liberals and progressives to work happily and effectively in organized movements and established institutions. This may be especially true in the area of organized religion. Such work involves compromise and patience. It must be compromise without surrender and patience without frustration; but even so these characteristics may seem to be evidences of lack of clarity in thought, depth of conviction and courage to pioneer. However, when I turn from the institutions of organized religion and those who work in them, I cannot visualize as a group all the fine individuals whom Dr. Chave thinks of as working intelligently and cooperatively in "a comprehensive program" which he calls religious education. Their efforts are comprehensive enough but are they related in a common pattern even in the minds of the people involved? Do they think of

themselves as religious educators or even as constituting a group? They have not in the past found the fellowship of the R.E.A. significant; but the time may now be more propitious for getting together these "liberals and progressives" from all sorts of professions and movements around their common devotion to religious education. One wonders, however, how interested they are to discuss the questions with which the article ends.

"This is the day for religious liberals to assert themselves." It is, brother; and it is late in the day! Some of us remember when they were not only asserting themselves, but seemed to have a most auspicious opportunity to demonstrate what they could do. And for a good part of the last thirty years the recognized leaders in religious education and those responsible for the training of future leaders have been liberals unless that term is to be used in a very limited sense. What kind of religious education has developed under their leadership?

"On every side traditional religionists . . .

are bemoaning the failure of organized religion to affect the standards and practices of personal-social living." Let those among the liberals and progressives who are young enough to have no responsibility for that failure cast the first stones! The rest of us after joining in confession and repentance had better seek some working relationship with those who are still working in religious institutions unless we have decided that for us as liberals and progressives that is impossible. We would, of course, welcome the fellowship and help of others who are working in other institutions. The alternative seems to be for liberals and progressives who see little opportunities of doing anything significant through specifically religious channels to try to create a fellowship (the R.E.A. or something else) among kindred spirits in many walks of life to join in creating or assembling vocabularies, literature, music, rituals and institutions, which give promise of developing into a new and better organized religion. That would certainly be a challenge!

#### XIV

MYRON TAGGART HOPPER

*Professor of Religious Education, The College of the Bible, Lexington, Kentucky*

AT THE outset let it be understood that the writer is in basic agreement with much that Professor Chave has said. This basic agreement is much greater than the amount of disagreement. There is agreement, for instance, in thinking that there is "urgent need for radical changes in the teaching of morals and religion." One change should be in the direction of helping growing persons understand the moral and religious significance of life as they face it in the twentieth century. Too long what has been called religious education has been too largely a matter of passing on information about the religion of the ancient Hebrews and the first century Christians. Now, the religious history of these people of centuries long gone is a glorious history. Becoming informed about it does not necessarily mean that one so informed becomes a

creative religious person in the twentieth century, however, nor does it mean that he will be able to live religiously in relation to contemporary situations. Before such is likely to be the case the experiences and issues of contemporary life must be lifted up and their moral and religious significance understood. Primary attention must be given to them rather than to the issues and experiences faced by persons who lived religiously centuries ago. Where the religious experience of the ancients sheds light upon the contemporary scene attention must, of course, be given to it, and there are other reasons for including a consideration of our religious heritage in the program of religious education. Nothing like the amount of time given in most curricula of religious education will be devoted to it, however, if adequate religious education is to be carried

on, for being informed about other peoples religion is not the same as being educated religiously. This latter comes from being helped to discover the religious meanings and implications of contemporary experience—from being guided into having first-hand religious experiences or, on more immature levels, being guided into those kinds of experiences which lay the groundwork for the more mature religious interpretation of life.<sup>1</sup>

This raises the question as to what is meant by the religious interpretation of life. Professor Chave has outlined what he means at this point by listing the ten categories which represent his analysis of religious living into functional factors. These are useful categories. It would seem to this writer that they fail to point up sufficiently that which is the essential characteristic of the religious approach to life however. That essential characteristic involves understanding and adjusting to life in the light of the demands of God<sup>2</sup> as the person comprehends them. To say the same thing differently experience becomes religious when the situation being faced is, to some degree at least, understood and responded to in the light of the demands of Ultimate Reality as conceived by the person having the experience.

Professor Chave does not in any sense exclude this essential characteristic of the religious way of life from his ten categories. A place is made for it in connection with his "Appreciation of the Universe" and his "Integration of Experience into a Working Philosophy of Life." He does not however give it the place of importance it merits in a consideration of religious education. It is not simply one of ten categories or two

of ten. It is the essential characteristic of the religious experience.

With this essential characteristic of religious living in mind religious education can be thought of as having three basic functions. The first of these is that of aiding growing persons to develop an awareness and understanding of the nature of God (i.e. that in the universe to which man must, in the last analysis make his adjustment). The second is that of helping growing persons deal with their everyday experiences in the light of the demands of God. The third is that of guiding growing persons in refining, clarifying and revising their conceptions of the nature of God and of what must be done to bring their living in harmony with the demands of God.

While it would not in any sense ignore practical religious living, religious education conceived in this fashion would give more attention to what might be called theological matters than it would seem Professor Chave would give to them. In one sense such "theological" considerations would be basic for through them the nature of God would be progressively understood. On the basis of this growing understanding of the demands of God implications for every day living on the religious level would be worked out. This attention to "theological" matters would not be a process of indoctrination in traditional theological concepts, nor for that matter in so-called liberal concepts. Religious education, especially where theology is concerned, should not be *propaganda* for either the depravity or worthfulness of man, or the transcendence or immanence of God, or for any other specific theological point of view. It should rather be as far as theology is concerned a process of helping growing persons analyze and understand the meaning of their experience and the experience of the race with the end in view of achieving a working understanding of the nature of God as a basis for the organization of life.

Emphasis is placed upon this matter of achieving a working understanding and appreciation of God because having such is basic. Without something of the sort there

1. What is meant here are those kinds of experiences which foster wonder, awe, reverence, thankfulness and the like which, in the view of the writer, are not religious in and of themselves but which are basic to the development of a religious approach to life.

2. A working definition of what is meant by God in this context is that in the universe to which man must, in the last analysis make his adjustment. Phrases like Ultimate Reality, Highest Value, etc., could well be used to describe what is meant, also.



is no valid way of deciding whether religious education should foster a sense of worth in persons or not. Without it there is no valid basis for discrimination in values or for deciding whether cooperative or competitive living is best. Without it there is no basis for the integration of experience into a working philosophy. It is, in the last analysis, the basis for that re-evaluation of values in the light of the highest that is known that is the heart of the religious experience. It is important, therefore, that religious education make a place for aiding growing persons in developing and revising their understanding of the nature of God.

This matter has been dealt with at such length only because the writer feels that Professor Chave has not given it sufficient emphasis in either his article or his ten categories. Indeed he seems to frown upon theology. This he does because he seems to equate "theology" with super-naturalism. The writer would agree with him completely that religious education has spent much too much time trying to indoctrinate people in out-grown concepts and in trying to rationalize pre-scientific concepts of the nature of God. He would agree with Professor Chave that such, "traditional teachings fail to grip the imagination or intellect of people accustomed to scientific ways of thinking." He would, however, give more of a place in religious education to helping persons develop a functioning theology that is in harmony with the modern world view than it would seem Professor Chave would.

From what he knows of Professor Chave's

point of view from other sources than the article under consideration the writer is inclined to feel that he would agree with what has been written. Be that as it may what has been written represents the major points of difference between the writer's point of view and the one expressed in the article. There is agreement in feeling that traditional religious teachings fail "to affect the standards and practices of personal-social living" largely because the truth that is in them is obscured by their being couched in pre-scientific language. There is agreement also that there is much spiritual sensitivity and creative ingenuity manifest outside organized religion. Religious educators should, of course, cooperate with such. There is agreement, too, that this is a time when religious liberals should witness for their faith. The tides are running against them as far as organized religion is concerned. If they do not speak up increasing numbers of the best trained minds will turn their backs on religion. This speaking up does not mean making a point of alienating traditional religionists, however. The role of the liberal must be on the one hand that of trying to help the traditionalist in religion reinterpret, revise and restate the basic elements of his faith in modern terms. On the other hand he must seek to work with those outside the church who "are seeking to correct human faults and shortcomings and . . . develop life on higher levels" helping them, and others also, to see that their concerns are of the essence of prophetic religion.

## XV

F. ERNEST JOHNSON

*Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University and Executive Secretary, Department of Research and Education, Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America*

THE FIRST OBSERVATION I am moved to make concerning Dr. Chave's article is that it will be very useful if it is made the starting-point of a bold and vigorous effort to define opposing philosophical positions among religious educators. It is, of course, a condensed statement of the position developed in his *Functional Approach to Religious Education*. I can testify to the

stimulating effect his writing has on many students' minds.

My difficulty in evaluating, for myself, Dr. Chave's argument is due to what I hope I may without offense call its extreme vagueness. I am quite at a loss to know what he means by "religious." Notice these characteristic terms: "religious ideas and ideals," "moral and religious teachings," "religious

concepts," "religious qualities," "complex nature of religion," "what is called religious, or spiritual," "religious or spiritual sensitivity." Now, what criteria of the religious emerge from these vague terms?

I think it fair to press the point because Dr. Chave is obviously trying sincerely and bravely to bring a rational and scientific outlook to bear upon religious assumptions. A prime requirement of this method is the application of the "law of parsimony," which might be laconically paraphrased thus: Have recourse to nothing gratuitous. Taking all Dr. Chave's references to religion together, one is almost convinced that to his mind, "religious" can be rendered, without reminder, by such words as moral and spiritual, and is therefore really vestigial. I say *almost*, because there is a possible exception to this generalization which in fairness should be noted at once. I refer to whatever is expressed in the words "cosmic and human relationships"; "laws and resources in the universe which support man's upward climb"; and "cosmic setting," as something needed for man's life.

Now I wish I knew how much Dr. Chave means by these references. If by cosmic support for man's striving he means "a power not ourselves which makes for righteousness," then he is putting content into the concept of religion that is not fully comprehended in the terms "moral" and "spiritual." But in that case one may ask why this spirited demand: "Instead of trying to add religion as a set of strange beliefs and customs to overcrowded and confused lives let growing persons become aware of the latent powers within themselves and in the processes in which they live, move and have

their being." And why the protest against an "imaginary deity"?

To be sure, Dr. Chave gives us a clue to his principal theological aversion in his reference to the dualism of "natural and supernatural" and to "the deities of the theologians" who are "unable to function in the total world." But if his chief concern is to combat supernaturalism in order to maintain the unity of nature and of experience surely this might be done while still retaining some specific content in the "religious" which would justify continuing to use the word. The hint of such content which Dr. Chave gives here and there are all but submerged in the main stream of his argument.

The confusion I experience in reading the article is nothing novel. I feel the same way when reading the arguments of those who contend for the isolation of religion as a private affair with which the State has no concern and then proceed to define religion—that is, *true* religion—as the very stuff of the good life, the heart of education and of all lofty social and political endeavor. Unless this ambiguity can be cleared up, the defenders of the "liberal" and "progressive" position are likely to have leveled against them the very charge that is hurled at liberal theologians, namely, that they are hanging on to words that do not fit their frame of reference.

Dr. Chave is entirely right in pointing out that some of the finest fruit is borne by vines that grow far from any theological reservation. This fact poses a problem that most of us have been culpably reluctant to face. I am grateful for this article, but I think the author needs to write another, and soon.

## XVI

FRANK M. MCKIBBEN

*Professor of Religious Education, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Illinois*

ONE CANNOT read Chave's interpretation of current religious education without sincere appreciation of the stimulating criticism he voices and the suggestiveness of much that he proposes by way of constructive measures. He presents in this

article, as well as in his books, a practical, persuasive statement of changes in emphasis, interpretation and method in religious education. Anyone interested in effective religious nurture will give hearty assent to the centrality and significance of the spiritual

values he describes as fundamental to character development. Surely any program worthy of support must seek to realize these ends in personality growth and social experience, whatever else it may attempt to achieve.

Chave very properly scores modern religious education for its sheer ineffectiveness, for clinging to many outmoded methods and questionable bodies of content. He might have stressed more the basic indifference to education that has characterized Protestantism and the lack of any fundamental Protestant strategy in religious education such as has characterized Catholicism and Judaism. Most of us have been making these criticisms for sometime. Many will not agree with Chave that such ineffectiveness is due solely or even primarily to the causes he mentions. Much of the failure of modern religious education is due simply to the fact that most of the conditions under which any kind of successful educational work may be done are not provided, or because of the halfhearted effort characteristic of most of our churches. It is one thing to agree with Chave in his description of the status of religious education but quite another matter to accept his philosophy of education in its totality and the measures to be taken to remedy the situation.

We are in accord with his emphasis upon the necessity of recognizing the developmental nature of religion and the need for testing all ideas and experiences through such measures as scientific method is able to provide. Yet when he raises the question: "Does this analysis indicate the true nature of what is called religious, or spiritual, and show how it grows?" we would say, yes, in part. We believe that God has been and is definitely active in history in the lives of men and nations, that this God has employed various means of making himself and his will known to men. We hold that most of what we know about God and his world has come through progressive experience and growing insights. While we do not accept the terms "revelation" and "supernatural" in their traditional connotation, yet we believe that some of the insights men have gained and the experiences they have had are so unique and

unusual that they stand as mountain peaks of understanding and appreciation in the religious history of mankind. These bodies of knowledge and experience religious leaders have every right, indeed are under obligation, to share with oncoming generations. We sympathize with Chave's impatience with sheer indoctrination without critical evaluation of what is being presented and without awakening a keen sense of inquiry on the part of the learner. But we feel that he is entirely too indiscriminately critical of aspects of religious education that inevitably lean in the direction of authoritarian teaching.

We agree with Chave when he says: "To develop moral judgment we need patient, wise guidance of growing persons, with training in analysis of factors, balancing of alternatives, cooperative thinking, experimental action, and skillful re-evaluation and integration of experiences. To develop religious concepts, values and practices likewise involves a careful process of education." But this process of education can go on while the teacher holds definitely to a "center of reference," and a "framework of theology" that his experience and that of the race or certain groups testifies to as valid and altogether true. Such a center and framework will almost inevitably have arisen as Chave himself proposes, functionally out of the ongoing experience of persons and groups. Such indeed to many is the essential nature of the profound insights and experiences of the prophets and of Jesus. When Chave says: "It is foolish to try to rationalize any particular doctrine, custom, or system, that arose in the past and try to get conformity to it," this is bringing a too sweeping and unfair judgment to bear upon much sound education. It is entirely unrealistic and naive to believe that anyone of us operates in education without some "beliefs," "customs," "ideas," or "values." None of us "starts from scratch." No learner can do so. Chave himself clings consistently and tenaciously to *his ten spiritual values*. Anyone of us who has heard him or read after him in the past fifteen years finds him inevitably presenting his ten spiritual values. While he generously encourages us



to criticize and change them as we will, one gets the impression that Chave feels that he "has arrived," and that he is pretty well convinced that in the end we will accept *his analysis* of the ends to be sought in education! He would therefore make and would have us make them the basic "content" of a new progressive program of religious education!

What we are trying to say is that there is much in Chave's presentation with which we are in hearty agreement, but that there are serious qualifications we would make in the direction hinted at in this all-too-abbreviated statement. We openly and honestly admit to start with that we believe in the uniqueness of the Hebrew-Christian religion, the "rock-bottom" realism and truthfulness of its interpretation of the nature and meaning of life as it arose functionally in experience, and the helpful guidance it provides in realizing the spiritual values life can yield. Operating within that framework of belief, simply or elaborately developed, we believe that it is possible to use much of the progressive methodology Chave pleads for. Certainly we would make central in any program of reli-

gious education the values he describes; we would seek to develop critical analysis and evaluation on the part of the learner of all ideas and experiences; we would certainly seek to bring religion down out of the realm of abstract ideas and symbols to tangible, concrete living realities in everyday experience; we would recognize our oneness with home, school, community agencies, and other forces in our common life that are in any way seeking to develop these same values in people, and strive to bring about ever increasing cooperation among all agencies engaged in educational effort. As we look through the list of questions Chave proposes, with the exception of several that have to do with his "functional approach to religion," we find them to be practically the same questions religious educators have been dealing with for the past quarter century and that they will be confronted with during several decades to come. Neither he nor any one of us has any panacea that will bring about a quick and sure solution to them. But we will all continue to work persistently, skillfully and cooperatively toward a more effective program of religious education.

## XVII

J. PAUL WILLIAMS

*Department of Religion, Mount Holyoke College*

THE EFFORT to give anything like an adequate reaction to Professor Chave's statement reminds me of a remark Professor Elliott wrote in my student days when I proposed a research project to him by letter; he answered that an adequate appraisal would require, not a letter, but a book. Professor Chave approaches his problem from assumptions greatly different from the assumptions of most contemporary students of religion and makes proposals which are not short of radical when viewed in the light of contemporary practice. Yet surely persons who still hope that they are liberal and progressive ("Liberalism is dead," one theological dean assured me) would agree with most of what Professor Chave has set down, though they would not necessarily agree with his choice of words or with his emphases. I am par-

ticularly enthusiastic about his recurring insistence on a functional approach to religion, about his recognition of the fact that there is much spiritual sensitivity among non-churchmen, and about his emphases on the necessity for liberalism to develop bold and dynamic affirmations.

I do have a major criticism of the position set forth. The article proposes a program for religious radicals, a program designed to undercut the naivete of persons who "vainly call on an imaginary deity for supernatural intervention." There can be no legitimate quarrel with this radical proposal as a sectarian program. The liberals, or religious humanists, as they might better be called in this case, should propagate their faith zealously. If we are to continue to have religious freedom, we must hold inviolate the right of

every group to make its own metaphysical formulation and to set in motion as strong missionary forces as it can.

But Professor Chave betrays the weakness of most sectarians. Unless I read him incorrectly, he thinks that his own antisupernatural, antimiraculous, naturalistic metaphysics is not sectarian, but is rather a broad platform on which we can get all the intelligent people of society to agree, if we will put forth enough effort, stimulate enough critical inquiry, and provide enough of the right kind of education. Most of the humanists, and also most of the old-fashioned liberals, neo-orthodox, and fundamentalists, assume that there is some one way of thinking about the universe which is indubitably true and which all intelligent men will one day follow. Religious radicals as well as religious conservatives think they have gotten hold of *The Truth*.

This faith breaks up on the hard rock of the limitations inherent in the nature of the human understanding. None of our beliefs about the ultimate are certain; rather they are a faith. The religious conservative supposes that our ignorance concerning final reality has been overcome by revelation; but the revelation he asks us to believe is so inconsistent and so opposed to modern discoveries that many moderns conclude it is little more than the wisdom of men who lived a long time ago and around whose ideas an aura of divinity has been thrown. The religious radical, on the other hand, supposes that since science has developed techniques and presented data which are incontrovertible, it, therefore, will eventually dispel human ignorance and uncertainty; but the conservative holds that science deals with but a fraction of human experience and is not in a position even to ask some of the most important questions. Surely it is true that as long as men are free, they are not going to agree on their metaphysics: the conservatives are not going to persuade all of us that supernaturalism is *The Truth*; nor are radicals going to persuade all of us that naturalism is *The Truth*.

Does this fact necessarily reduce the pro-

gram of Liberal Progressives to just another sectarianism? I think not. Sectarianism is a precious thing and it needs to be fostered. But it is already given ample room for expression by our religious system; we are long on sectarian organization. What we lack most is an effective means of unifying our society spiritually. The most important spiritual problem of our day is: How can we find the spiritual values which will preserve and enhance democracy in the midst of world revolution? Professor Chave has written effectively on this problem. He has given us an admirable statement in his ten categories of what these values might be. But he has confused the issue by implying that Liberal Progressives, even while trying to get society-wide support for democratic values, should attack supernaturalism. Yet democratic values are supported by many supernaturalists—and must come to be supported by many more, if we are ever to achieve an equitable society.

Surely we who call ourselves Liberal Progressives must travel in the direction of Professor Chave's statement of values; moreover, we must quicken *religious faith* in such values, that is, we must bring Americans to the belief that these values have metaphysical sanctions, are part of the very nature of things. But no matter how much we believe in a particular sectarianism, we should not insist that only our type of metaphysics can undergird democracy. Teaching that values have metaphysical sanctions is not the same as teaching a metaphysical system. Teaching (indoctrinating) a metaphysical system is a sectarian practice, since intelligent and sensitive men can never be brought to accept a common metaphysics. But insisting that democratic values must have some type of metaphysical sanction is not sectarian (unless belief in democracy be called sectarian). The suggestion is that the program of the Liberal Progressive is *religious* education should be an effort to bring the resources of religion to the preservation and enhancement of democracy. In the struggle for democracy, we must find ways of enlisting the labors of a wide variety of religious devotees.

# ABSTRACTS OF DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS In Religious Education 1948-1949

Assembled by

Helen F. Spaulding

Associate Director in Research of the International Council  
of Religious Education, Chicago, Illinois

THE FOLLOWING abstracts of doctoral dissertations completed between June 1948 and June 1949 have been assembled with the cooperation of the professors in charge of the research and the students in thirteen graduate schools. In the interest of research in religious education, it is encouraging to note that about as many dissertations were reported for the year indicated above as for the preceding biennium. However, this collection cannot be regarded as including all doctoral dissertations for the year 1948-49.

The dissertations abstracted below are in the field of religious education and closely related interests. The fifteen in this article were chosen from a collection of twenty-nine. A second article, containing the rest of the abstracts will be published in a later issue of *Religious Education*.

Persons interested in reviewing an entire dissertation may, in nearly all cases, obtain it on library two-week loan. The procedure is to ask the local public or institutional library to borrow it from the particular university library.

Reprints of both this article and the later one may be secured at 25 cents each, or 40 cents for both, (cash with order) from the International Council of Religious Education, 206 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago 4, Illinois.

AKAMATSU, ALFRED SABURO, *The Function and Type of Program of a Japanese Minority Church in New York City*. Ed.D., Union Theological Seminary major, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York. 1948. 268 pages. *Sponsoring Committee*: Harrison S. Eliott,

chairman, R. Freeman Butts, Martin P. Chworowsky, Charles W. Iglehart.

*Problem and Limits*: When the program of resettlement of the Japanese Americans from relocation centers started, both the church and government agencies followed the traditional American pattern of assimilation and adopted a policy of dispersion of the resettlers in the places of resettlement. But in New York most of the Christian resettlers came to the existing Japanese American minority churches. Naturally this fact presented the churches with a searching problem: What should be their basic policy? Should they follow the policy of assimilation and work for their eventual dissolution? Or is any other philosophy and practice more suitable for the minority church in a democratic society? The fundamental quest of this project is to determine the basic policy of a Japanese American minority church in New York and to formulate the type of program suitable for the minority and for the country in which it exists.

*Procedure*: In order to formulate the basic policy of the church, the history of the Japanese immigration was briefly reviewed, and the development of the Japanese American community in New York City was examined. Because the treatment of the Japanese Americans was an integral part of the pattern of America's effort to meet the minority problems, the history of immigration as a whole and its restrictions as well as the American patterns of the treatment of minorities were examined, and a philosophy for minority groups developed and defended. On the basis of this background material, a proposal was

made for the establishment of the Japanese American Church of Christ in New York City.

*Findings and Conclusions:* These studies reveal the fact that the basic thread in the American pattern has been that of assimilation, which has insisted that the immigrants discard their cultural heritages and accept and conform to the cultural pattern of the dominant group. Historically assimilation as the expression of a nation's willingness to accept the newcomers into its social life, contributed much to the present greatness of this country. But a critical examination discloses the fact that its presuppositions are one with racism which accepts the absoluteness of the dominant race and culture. The theory of assimilation is, then, scientifically untenable; it violates the fundamental principle of democracy that an individual is of value and is an end in himself and never the means; it infringes upon democratic ideals of the freedom and equality of men. Because it over-emphasizes the uniformity, it has created in the members of minority groups psychological insecurity and contributed to the family disintegration of immigrants.

Cultural democracy has arisen in reaction to racist presuppositions of assimilation. It encourages the minority groups to perpetuate and enrich their cultural heritages, so that they in turn may contribute creatively to the dynamic and democratic American culture, within the framework of democratic principles.

Under assimilation a minority church is a misfit; under cultural democracy it has a unique function to perform: namely, to enhance the emotional security of the members of the minority and to provide the background and opportunity for their cultural contribution. A Japanese minority church in New York City should, therefore, be strengthened by the merger of existing and divided churches into a well-equipped interdenominational church with adequate personnel and financial resources. Its program should include not only traditional religious programs, but also programs of cultural and social interests. The separate church life, however, should be supplemented by the active

participation of the church and its members in the enterprises of the larger community, so that the members of the minority will be naturally integrated into the larger American life.

ANDERSON, MARY ESTHER. *An Analysis of the Closely Graded Lessons For Children in the Light of the Laws of Growth*. Ph.D., Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts. 1949. 271 pages.

*Sponsoring Committee:* Walter G. Mueller, Chester M. Alter, Donald Maynard, Sam Hedrick, Walter Holcomb.

*Problem and Limits:* To analyze the Methodist Closely Graded Lessons for Children in the light of the laws of growth: (1) law of readiness, (2) law of effect, (3) law of exercise with a purpose, in order to ascertain if the curriculum, methods, and materials fulfill the ideals of sound educational theory and to what extent they deviate from such norms if deviation should prove the case. To determine if the avowed educational ideals of the Graded Lessons are implemented by the types of materials and methods consistent with the ideals.

The dissertation was limited in that the teacher's textbook of the kindergarten and primary groups had been considered for one quarter of each year only. Textbooks for juniors included the study of the entire year.

*Procedure:* The analytical and comparative methods were used. Each age group was analyzed according to the physical, mental, social, and religious development of the child. The scientific data of Gesell and Ilg were used as the norm; a statement was made concerning the readiness of the child to develop; the viewpoints of selected psychologists, religious educators, and of the Closely Graded Lessons were compared to determine agreement or disagreement.

*Findings and Conclusions:* 1. Learning arises out of experience as "meaning" and re-enters experience as insights and controls. The "story-telling" method has been emphasized too generally with primaries. In Lessons for Juniors 2 and 3, greater stress is necessary on the teacher's use of varied and interesting methods. His perfected skills need to be used in Christian living.

2. Teaching should be child-centered. The lessons neglect to deal with the moral problems of the nine and ten-year-old with the same specificity of analysis as do Gesell and Ilg.

3. Religious development is gradual. The lessons do not agree with Gesell and Ilg that the kindergartner has no sense of good and bad, but hold that God may be associated with the kindergartner's everyday experiences. The lessons agree that in conduct problems of later childhood the change from authority to inner controls is accomplished through study, research, discussion, reflective thinking, use of skills and the choices which the junior is led to make. Jesus may be so presented to the eleven-year-old as to receive his supreme allegiance.

4. The lessons present the Bible in connection with the life of the child. A few Old Testament stories from which undesirable parts have been deleted, are used, not just to satisfy the demand for "Bible Stories" but to meet definite goals. In Unit 6, Part 2 of the junior course, materials used are apt to be too familiar and lack of interest may result.

5. Physical growth is a potent influence in the religious development of the child. More emphasis on the physical aspect of growth is needed in the lessons for ages six, nine, and eleven.

6. There is agreement that the matter of wise and understanding guidance is paramount in the development of the child.

7. The Closely Graded Lessons for children are written in the light of the laws of growth. Sometimes divergences from the interpretation of the selected authorities occur; however, where there is divergence, it is generally acknowledged.

BOETTCHER, HENRY J. *Activities in Religious Education*. Ph.D., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota. 1949. 164 pages.

*Sponsoring Committee:* Leo J. Brueckner, chairman, Guy L. Bond, co-chairman, George Conger, Herbert Feigl, Walter W. Cook, G. Lester Anderson, Ruth E. Eckert.

*Problem and Limits:* The purpose of this experimental study was to determine whether

or not there is a significant difference in the effectiveness of two different methods of instruction in the field of religious education. The two methods differ on the basis of the kind, number, and variety of pupil activities which were provided in the two teaching-learning processes. For purposes of control, activities were embodied in a workbook, "Learning and Living." Learning in the control groups was essentially of the "memoriter" type, by the assignment-memorization-recitation method, while learning in the experimental groups consisted of a variety of purposeful activities for a problem-solving nature.

*Design and Procedure:* By random sampling eight elementary Lutheran schools in Minnesota were selected. By randomization pupils in grades seven and eight in each participating school were divided into control and experimental groups. Two hundred twenty-one pupils were involved in the main part of the study: 104 in the control groups, 117 in the experimental groups. All factors except activities, the experimental factor, were held constant. Comparability of the groups was established by the Kuhlmann-Anderson Test of Mental Ability, and the Sims Socio-Economic Rating Scale. A unit on "Active Neighborly Love, Second Table of the Mosaic Law," was selected as the curriculum. Goals were clarified in terms of knowledge, attitudes, and behavior patterns. A valid and reliable test was developed and used, first as a pre-test to determine initial learning, and six weeks of teaching and learning following, with teacher, texts, curriculum, curriculum goals, and time held constant. The same test was given as a re-test. Differences in gains were compared, first school by school and subsequently, after assumptions underlying pooling of scores had been met, by groups. Significance of differences in gains were tested by the "t" test and by the analysis of covariance. Analyses were also made to determine if differences in gains were correlated in any way with intelligence and initial learning.

*Findings and Conclusions:* 1. In the school by school comparisons in each of the eight complete and self-contained experiments, the



analysis of the data does not warrant the conclusion that there is a significant difference in the two methods of teaching and learning.

2. A consistent tendency of the experimental groups to exceed in gains the control groups was noted, however.

3. A similar tendency was noted when school by school comparisons of gains were made separately on the gains in knowledge, in attitude and in behavior patterns. On the part of the test designed to measure retention of memorized materials, the gains of the experimental group were consistently larger.

4. When the schools were grouped and compared, with differences in intelligence and initial learning held constant, the differences in gains were found to be significant at the 1 per cent level. This provides the conclusive answer to the question which this experimental study was designed to answer.

5. When the control groups were compared with three all-experimental schools the superiority of the activity method was established to an even greater degree of certainty.

6. A comparison of the higher with the lower intelligence levels in the experimental groups revealed that brighter pupils profit more by the experimental method than the slow learners.

7. A similar comparison of pupils of high initial learning scores with those of low initial scores revealed that both groups profit equally by the experimental method.

*Implications:* 1. The introduction of a variety of learning activities, even if only in the form of a well-constructed workbook, into the classrooms of religion seems warranted.

2. Seminaries and teacher-training institutions should orient their training program to the activity concept more than they have done in the past.

3. Since the unit procedure lends itself best to the introduction of a variety of learning activities, particularly those which enlist the participation of the parents and of persons in the community, this type of curriculum organization should be provided for

by those who edit and publish materials of instruction for religious education.

CLARK, WILLIAM FRANCIS. *The Volunteer Lay Leadership of the United Church of Canada in Rural Saskatchewan*. Ed.D., Union Theological Seminary major, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York. 1949. 168 pages.

*Sponsoring Committee:* Harrison S. Elliott, chairman, Ruth Strang, Arthur L. Swift, Jr.

*Problem and Limits:* To review recent research and developments in leader education and propose ways of making this available to the volunteer lay leaders of the rural church, being convinced that this could contribute to its leadership and Christian education program despite professed inadequacies of space, time, equipment and professional direction. The United Church of Canada in rural Saskatchewan was selected for purposes of this study.

*Procedure:* Extensive field experience was followed by (1) a study of recent emphases in education, religious education, and rural sociology with particular attention to theory and practice of pre-service and in-service leadership education; (2) a study of the rural church in the area, its program and related sociological trends; (3) an extensive questionnaire survey of ministers and volunteer lay leaders to determine present practices and needs; (4) a study of programs of religious bodies, educational groups and related agencies providing in-service leadership education in constituencies facing all or some of the limitations of the area being studied. Findings were interpreted in terms of the needs found in the field, suggestions were made, and a proposed program for implementation developed.

*Findings and Conclusions:* The educational program of the rural church needs to recognize assets of rural family life, trends in community social life, the educational significance of each aspect of its total program and potential resources within the local community.

The survey revealed serious inadequacies in number and training of leaders, but indicated that leaders are potentially available. It revealed that many leaders accepted re-

sponsibility after years of relative inactivity. Leaders reported a desire to serve the church more adequately, enjoyment of present work, and willingness to do more if given the opportunity. They felt ill-equipped for their particular responsibilities and expressed a willingness to participate in more in-service leadership education. For the average leader most of the pre-service and in-service leadership education program must be provided locally. An appreciation of the real value of the church's Christian education program by its total membership would ease the strict financial and time limitations imposed on the present program.

The study makes clear that an integrated educational program in the church, coordinated with other community resources and supplemented by planned recruitment, apprenticeship, and in-service education, will provide for many of the needs of volunteer lay leaders. A local church with such a program as an experimental situation, offering guidance to other leaders and churches, supplemented by representation and leadership on area, presbytery, and conference committees, could lead to the appointment of area consultants, demonstration centers, and other activities which would in turn offer experience and guidance to an expanding group of leaders and churches and contribute to improved leadership in the rural churches of Saskatchewan.

**GIDEON, SINCLAIR SAMWORTH.** *A Plan to Modify the Policy, Organization and Program of Ewing Christian College, Allahabad, India, with a View to Emphasizing a Democratic Way of Life.* Ed.D., Union Theological Seminary major, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York. 1949. 122 pages.

*Sponsoring Committee:* Harrison E. Elliott, chairman, Charles W. Iglehart, Donald G. Tewksbury.

*Problem and Limits:* India's long struggle for freedom has at long last ended. The rapidly changing conditions demand that Ewing Christian College re-examine carefully how best it can serve the needs of the country and the Church of Christ in the new India. The purpose of this project is to offer suggestions

for modifications in the college to meet the new situation.

*Procedure:* Four factors, important as the basis for determining the proposals to be made, were explored: first, the present situation in Ewing Christian College, based on the author's personal knowledge and special publications about the college; second, the situation in India, the basis for which was various books and other documents about the new India; third, the role of Christian higher education under the new conditions, which required a study of the functions which Christian higher education has sought to fulfill in the past; and fourth, basic assumptions as to education and democracy, and their inter-relation, which involved use of basic books on education, democracy, and education for democracy.

*Findings and Conclusion:* Ewing Christian College, founded in 1902 and one of three units of Allahabad Christian College, is legally the property of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., but the immediate direction and control is vested in a representative Board of Directors in India. The student body numbers six to seven hundred, of whom twenty-five are women and about sixty or seventy are Christians. The curriculum is composed of the usual college subjects with provision for a study of the languages pertinent to India. English, health and physical education, and moral and religious instruction are required.

Political unity is an absolute necessity in the new India. Religious fanaticism and fear of conversion and coercion are the enemies of this unity. There is great discontent due to the unjust distribution of wealth. The social problems of India center round the caste system and class distinctions. The major national problem is communal conflict. India is mostly an illiterate country. A major aim of Christian higher education in India has been the conversion of non-Christians to Christianity. Education should be for the maximum development of each person into a worthwhile personality with a distinctive individuality and should prepare individuals to assume responsibility in solving the problems of India on a democratic basis.

Christian education in India should become a project of the church in India instead of a foreign mission. The purpose of the college in the future should not be conversion, but education for democratic leadership in the country and for the preparation of the requisite leadership for the Church of Christ in India. The college should be recognized so that those who are affected by decisions have a right to participate in making these decisions. To this end, suggestions are made for representation of non-Christian faculty members and of students in the organization; for the participation of students in making the rules for the resident halls and for the use of these hostels for transcending caste and other differences; for the participation of student organizations as agencies for training in democracy. Because of university control of education, the curriculum is determined outside the college and is subject-matter-centered, but suggestions are made as to the possibilities within the present set-up for students and teachers to plan together in a democratic way and for students to get such experience as will give them firsthand understanding of the problems with which they deal. It is suggested that life situations should become the organizing center for religious education within a Christian democratic community life and the inter-faith possibilities in the situation are outlined. For success in the democratization of the college, the teachers must have understanding of and experience in the democratic way of life. The college should seek to become a Christian democratic community where students will learn what they live and live what they learn. Possible steps in securing the democratic consideration of the proposals are outlined in the study.

GOLDSTEIN, MARTIN. *A Study in the Degree of Prayer Consciousness of Students of Jewish Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform Schools in New York City*. Ph.D., New York University, New York, New York. 1949. 180 ages.

*Sponsoring Committee:* Samuel L. Hamilton, chairman, Abraham I. Katsh, George R. Cervený.

*Problem:* The problem of the investiga-

tion was to determine the degree of prayer consciousness experienced by students of Jewish Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform schools with respect to thoughts and feelings during prayer, factors inducing prayer consciousness, habits of prayer, concepts of God, language of prayer, sex, and intelligence.

*Method:* The procedure followed in collecting the data on prayer consciousness was the questionnaire method, supplemented by personal interviews. The schools selected for the investigation included five Yeshivahs, six Talmud Torahs, five Conservative schools, and five Reform Schools. The questionnaire was given to more than two hundred students, boys and girls, of each type of school, the students' ages ranging from eleven through thirteen. The Otis Self-Administering Test, Intermediate Group, Form A, of thirty minutes duration, was administered for the purpose of seeking a correlation between intelligence and prayer consciousness.

*Results:* Yeshivah students led all other groups for an overwhelming majority in the recitation of all specific prayers, with the Talmud Torah second by a sizable majority over the Conservative and the Reform groups. The five dominant thought feelings of all groups during prayer are "pride in Jewishness," "feeling of thanks," "love for God," "desire for forgiveness," and "nearness to God." In the translation of the Hebrew prayers, the Yeshivah students demonstrate an overwhelming superiority over the students of other schools. Significant stimulants affecting prayer consciousness are children's mental states, prayer in their "own words," "aloneness," "reading softly," and comprehension of prayers. God is visualized by the students of all schools as the "King of the Universe," who is "someone near," and yet "a spirit," pictured as "a father," or as "a friend."

*Conclusions:* The crucial factor in producing prayer consciousness is apparently the degree of education and religiosity. It appears that Hebrew stimulates greater prayer consciousness than English, when the Hebrew prayer is sufficiently understood, and familiar to the worshipper, and has specificity of purpose. Besides the stimulus to prayer con-

sciousness that is inherent in the suggestive content of any specific prayer, there also operates the stimulus of the worshipper's mood, temperament, and similar subjective characteristics. Comprehension of the traditional prayers is the most dominant and the most emphatically desired condition for effective prayer. Girls are more sensitive to prayer than boys. Intelligence—superior or inferior—plays no role in the experience of prayer.

GRIMES, L. HOWARD. *Making Lay Leadership Effective: An Historical Study of Major Issues in the Use of Laymen by the Methodist Church Especially for its Education Program*. Ph.D., Union Theological Seminary major, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York. 1949.

*Sponsoring Committee:* R. Bruce Raup, chairman, Harrison S. Elliott, major adviser, John T. McNeil.

*Problem and Limits:* The Methodist Church in the United States is today faced with the unprecedented task of furnishing leadership for its eight million members, committed, as it is in great measure, to the principle of lay, voluntary leadership but without a clear policy concerning the place of laymen in the church. Further, its facilities for leadership education are insufficient to provide effective training for these laymen. The purpose of the research was to examine the historical sources related to issues involved in lay leadership and leadership education to see what light the history throws upon the modern situation, not as the basis for presenting a program of leadership education but rather a philosophy upon which such a program might be based.

*Procedure:* The official records of both the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, beginning before the nineteenth century were examined. Interdenominational records were searched for further light on the issues. Secondary sources were used to give additional data, especially for the English background of American Methodism. Pamphlets, periodicals, and other sources were also examined, and the material was organized around issues

involved in the nature and function of lay leadership and in a program of leadership preparation.

*Findings and Conclusions:* It was found that from the beginning of the Methodist movement, there have been two streams of thought within its tradition. John Wesley, its founder, was a high church Anglican who developed religious societies which emphasized the fellowship principle and used laymen for many activities ordinarily reserved for clergymen. American Methodism began through the efforts of laymen and continued to move with the frontier in the same manner. It developed a church structure, however, which made it necessary for laymen to struggle for over a century in order to secure full representation in its official bodies. In the meantime, they also asserted themselves through lay-centered movements within the organized church. While no one conception of the church is found in Protestant church history, that which has been most characteristic of Methodism emphasizes the church as a voluntary fellowship of laymen.

This is in keeping with the Protestant principle of the priesthood of believers. In view of the historical evidence, it is contended that Methodism must increasingly seek to make the church a real fellowship of Christians whose leadership is primarily lay and voluntary. This necessitates a well thought out policy for lay leadership.

The idea that laymen need special preparation has spread slowly during the past century, and although it is accepted in principle for leaders in the educational program of the church, it is far from being implemented there, and much less so for other leadership. Hence, one of the central issues which the church must face is motivation—finding ways of encouraging leaders to take advantage of the program of leadership education which it offers. Although in the earliest days, training was done on a practical, apprenticeship basis, the tendency during the past century has been to organize it into formal classes which may not have direct relationship to the leader's own job. More recently, an attempt has been made to place the responsibility on the local church for this train-

ing, though as yet no satisfactory solution has been found for making this practicably possible. The plan of having specially trained leaders go into local churches to work with leaders there is a possible means of meeting this problem. Beginning with the primary emphasis on the religious experience of the leader, with some concern for his acquiring knowledge of the Bible, other elements have been added to the content of leadership education — methodology, pupil psychology, and specialization — with little effort to integrate these elements. Some attempt has been made within recent years to put them together in "laboratory schools" and in informal, on-the-job training in the local church. Workshops and institutes also help to solve this problem.

A leadership training program must be provided in which the emphasis of early Methodism upon the apprenticeship principle and upon religious experience are not lost and in which the Christian heritage is related vitally to the present situations and problems among leaders and in the churches, but in which also all leaders in the local churches have opportunity to grow both in insight and skills.

HAND, GEORGE OTHELL. *Changing Emphases in American Evangelism From Colonial Times to the Present*. Th.D., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky. 1949. 214 pages.

*Sponsoring Committee:* Gaines S. Dobbins, chairman, S. L. Stealey, Clyde Francisco, Findley Edge, Charles McGlon.

*Problem and Limits:* To ascertain a sound philosophy and perspective regarding the advance of Christianity as revealed in a survey of the causative factors, development and leaders, and unique stratagems of major evangelistic emphases through the years of American history. To ascertain facts and implications relevant to effective evangelism for today.

The major evangelistic emphases (*revivalism, Christian nurture, sociological evangelism, and educational evangelism*) were chosen. These epochs were confined to evangelical denominations and included a period

of approximately three hundred years—from the Great Awakening to the present.

*Procedure:* Scholarly and reputable historical treatments representing concentrated research, contemporary periodicals, official denominational reports, and questionnaires were employed in making an objective survey of each evangelistic emphasis. Problems and causative factors precipitating different approaches in evangelism, predominant characteristics, unique stratagems, and results were examined. On the basis of findings, a critical evaluation of points of strength and weakness concluded the surveys of each epoch.

*Findings and Conclusions:* 1. Effective evangelism must be indigenous to the times, circumstances, and culture in which it is called upon to function. Any effective technique must emerge as a natural outgrowth in response to distinctive needs and opportunities rather than a detached employment *in toto* of a particular strategy, however successful it might have been.

2. Effective evangelism must be conceived as a continuing process throughout life—presenting the "good news" to the Christian as well as the prospective Christian, rather than spasmodic efforts that are terminated with conversion.

3. Effective evangelism, guided by clearly defined Christian aims, must confront the individual in the totality of his relationships; it must be concerned with the "whole of life" and not merely the "sacred" aspects.

4. Effective evangelism includes an adapted presentation of the evangel—that is, a skillful adaptation of the message and method in the effort to meet the need for a personal, intelligent, vital, and relevant approach to all levels of society and all ages.

The outstanding observation is that history clearly declares there has been no prescribed formula whereby evangelism is made one hundred per cent effective. Convinced that, in all probability, there shall be no such formula in the future, *visitation evangelism* is proposed as an eclectic combination of the essentials which have been found expedient and effective in past experience, and which meet the peculiar needs of the present. This plan consists of at least two major elements:



first, bold, biblical, Spirit-filled preaching and teaching; second, the taking of the message to others by those who have been stimulated and enriched by such Christian experiences.

**HYDE, FLOY S.** *Protestant Leadership Education Schools*. Ph.D., Union Theological Seminary major, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York. 1949. 273 pages.

*Sponsoring Committee:* Goodwin Watson, chairman, Harrison S. Elliott, major adviser.

*Problem and Limits:* An appraisal of the Leadership Education Schools, as currently standardized by the International Council of Religious Education as a means of training church leaders.

*Procedure:* An evaluation of the ICRE plan on the basis of criteria for effective leadership education, plus an examination and appraisal of the way it works out in a given area—New York City. Data were secured in regard to the New York City Leadership Education Schools through a research project completed by the writer in 1946 for the Protestant Council of New York City, the period under intensive consideration being the year 1945, the area surveyed including all five boroughs of the city. Methods of inquiry included analysis of 3,028 questionnaires (of five types) returned by students and teachers of these schools, study of records and compilation of statistics for the period of 1923-1947, personal attendance at planning and executive committees, visitation of every class in 1945, study of curriculum, study of teachers' qualifications and methods, analysis of past and current programs, and personal interviews with students, teachers, and directors.

*Findings and Conclusions:* *Commendable features* of the plan include significance of the initial effort to devise an interdenominational program; careful attention to matters of organizational and administrative detail; earnest attempt to provide assistance to faculty through Leader's Guides, written helps, and like processes; promise of fruitful development in Third Series courses; and general effort at supervision and maintenance of standards through requirements for accreditation.

*Apparent weaknesses* (as verified by research concerning New York program);

1. The plan itself contains no minimum standards regarding physical accommodation, numbers per class, or character of class groupings. Results in New York City: 64 per cent of classes had an enrollment of more than twenty; classes were so heterogeneous in character that one-third of the faculty affirmed that their best teaching efforts were circumscribed and limited by the teaching situation.

2. *In the curriculum:* (a) Beginning teachers are asked to attend classes which provide for study about work to be done but which offer no opportunity for development of necessary skills through laboratory-school or field-work experience. In New York City, among the requests for "other aids," students wanted first (36%) "opportunity to observe others in demonstration or laboratory classes," and second (27%) "supervision — including personal coaching, observation, and assistance in classroom teaching." (b) Courses are listed in wide variety without stated help toward a proper combination or without provision for a system of advisory assistance to students before or at time of registration. Result in New York City: most local schools failed to recognize responsibility in these areas. (c) Content courses are designed for presentation "in general," rather than for use with specific and defined age groups so that significant combinations cannot readily be made for any given purpose. In New York City 51 per cent of students registering for content courses wanted methods definitely interrelated or integrated. (d) Courses are frequently presented out of relation to the actual task of leadership. Result in New York City: practically no work corresponding to the workshop method of general education, although the Third Series would allow for such, if developed. (e) In the First and Second Series courses, sufficient adaptations have not been made through the years to emerging and changing needs of students with the result that undue responsibility rests on local committees. New York City developed 13 per cent of its courses as "specials" in 1945.

3. The plan fails to provide specifically for democratic administration. Result in New York City: A highly efficient organization, but little or no representation from the "people."

MCKEEFERY, WILLIAM J. *A Critical Analysis of Quantitative Studies of Religious Awakening*. Ph.D., Union Theological Seminary major, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York. 1949. 160 pages.

*Sponsoring Committee:* Helen M. Walker, chairman, Harrison S. Elliott, major adviser, Horace L. Friess.

*Problem and Limits:* The problem is defined by the following questions: what is the nature of the experience by which consciousness of a relationship between an individual and his God first occurs; what is the effect of the experience; what names are given to it; when and where does it take place; is there any significant relationship between certain background factors of the individual and his type of awakening experience? Also, to what extent can existing quantitative studies of religious awakening be relied upon?

*Procedure:* Thirty-two previous studies of religious awakening comprising about 7,000 cases were collected and evaluated by criteria for design and structure. Accounts of the religious awakenings of 1,306 students in fifty-three United States colleges were obtained by questionnaire. The latter study repeats a survey made by E. T. Clark twenty years earlier. Quantitative data from all investigations of religious awakening were classified and correlated.

*Findings and Conclusions:* 1. Two types of awakening experience were found: those in which consciousness of a relationship with God burst out suddenly (30% of the cases) and most often reported as "awakening" or "conversion," those of a more gradual development (70%) most often termed "realization."

2. The most frequent effect of the awakening experience was a continued relationship between the individual and his God.

3. Thirty years ago awakenings were reported to occur most often at public gather-

ings; today, more often when the individual is alone.

4. The mean age for awakenings was as follows: sudden type-male 16.8 years, females 15.9 years; gradual types-males 15.9 years, females 14.2 years. Recent studies place corresponding mean ages later than those above.

5. Respondents in the author's study who reported gradual awakenings rated their personal religious activity, home and church school religious training, and regularity of church school attendance significantly higher than the total group.

Although early studies often used atypical population samples, narrow definitions of awakenings, and subjective interpretations, they have descriptive value within their limits.

Factors in the background of many individuals were significantly related to the type of religious awakening experienced. Religious education may be used to shape the mode and time of religious awakening.

MAVES, PAUL BENJAMIN. *The Religious Education of Older People*. Ph.D., Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, New Jersey. 1949. 168 pages.

*Sponsoring Committee:* James V. Thompson, Floyd Shacklock, William G. Chanter.

*Problem and Limits:* The author attempted to discover answers to the following problems: (1) what is the situation in certain representative local churches in relation to the religious education of older people; (2) what can be done to help the ministers in these selected local churches to develop Christian religious education programs that more effectively help older people to discover a sense of meaningfulness, to accept the losses of aging, and to achieve the compensations of later maturity; and (3) how can such programs enable older people to achieve and maintain personalities characterized by maturity, wholesomeness, and creativity, and which, therefore, become personally satisfying, socially desirable, and individually winsome?

The study was limited to thirteen representative Methodist churches in one of the

annual conferences during a two year period 1946-1948.

*Procedure:* The author selected thirteen churches whose ministers agreed to participate in the study and to whom the purposes of the study had been fully explained. The data were gathered by means of periodic conferences with the thirteen ministers, by personal observation of the church program, and by conferences with groups in the church. The relationship established with the ministers was similar to that of a conference director of religious education without administrative responsibility or authority. Not only did the author hold periodic conferences with the ministers over a two year period to help them to analyze their situation, to discover resources and develop program, but he supplied them with information about older people and attempted to stimulate their interest in this age group. He attempted to avoid prodding but he made himself available as a resource if the ministers were ready to use him.

*Findings and Conclusions:* In relation to the total membership of the church, the participation of older people in the program of the church was on the whole better than that of other age groups, but no special program had been planned for them and little consideration was given to their needs, even though they found much satisfaction in their relation to the church. Such programs as existed for adults in which they could participate tended to be stereotyped and were unintentionally exploitive rather than creative. In about half of the ministers, interest in older people was aroused and their program expanded, but in the other half no response was secured. The effectiveness of the programs of the churches depended primarily upon the personal adjustment of the minister, and secondarily upon his training. The great diversity of the churches studied suggested that no general pattern or program could be devised which would fit all situations, but careful analysis must be made of each situation, and records must be kept which will allow for such an analysis. Help most effectively given to ministers in expanding their program demands a continu-

ing personal relationship of a long range character rather than a sporadic drive or long-distance promotion. Finally the church has a very important part to play in helping persons find meaning in later maturity.

The most important conclusion was that the possibility and effectiveness of a program for older people in a local church depends upon the minister's personal adjustment and his professional competence. Emotional blocking in regard to age groups or types of program render change improbable. An analysis is also made of the way in which the church can contribute to meaningfulness in later maturity.

PERKISON, HAZEL L. *A Plan of Democratic Procedures for the Sunday Evening Club*. Ed.D., Union Theological Seminary major, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York. 1949.

*Sponsoring Committee:* Harrison S. Elliott, chairman, Frank W. Herriott, L. Thomas Hopkins, Donald G. Tewksbury.

*Problem and Limits:* The purpose of the project was to propose plans and procedures to increase the democratic functioning of the Sunday Evening Club, The Church-in-the-Gardens, Forest Hills, New York City, a group of about sixty-five high school youth.

*Procedure:* These included: a survey of the life of the young people of the Sunday Evening Club—their national heritage, home, school, and church life; a careful study and critical evaluation of the program and life of the Club over a number of months; study of democratic procedures as developed by other groups; preliminary experimentation with democratic processes in the Church School and through incidental opportunities to introduce democratic experiences into the program of the Sunday Evening Club; and formulation of philosophy and criteria of the democratic process on which the proposals are based.

*Findings and Conclusions:* The survey revealed various misconceptions and misapplications of democratic principles but indicated also some possibilities for democratic functioning. The study of the Club showed that the leaders, both student and adult, were autocratic, ignoring the situations and needs

of the members and their creative abilities, especially in the planning of programs. Conflicts within the group and between the Club and other groups were certainly not helped by the limited communication. In contrast, the democratic process assumes confidence of the group as a social unit having common interests and ability to function inter-relatedly in creative ways, and as to method, it is the process of cooperative group thinking, growing out of life situations of those involved.

From their incidental experiences with a democratic process, the members of the Club decided eventually to try the democratic method in planning their programs. The following proposals were developed for the use of the Club in carrying out its decisions: it was recommended that group study be used to increase the understanding of the democratic process as it functions in the group; also that parliamentary practices be replaced by democratic discussion, resolutions, and dictation by group agreement and action. It was further proposed that leaders accept the democratic role and that responsibility be placed upon the total membership for initial planning of programs as well as for carrying them out, and that the functional approach be adopted. In the functional methodology, the group sets forth its own situations and problems, studies willingly and thoughtfully each contribution to their solution, and comes to some group decision which the group carries out, either by unified activity or by committees or members responsible to the group. Responsibility for thinking and action are serious limitations of the process, as are time and willingness to act according to it. Opportunities for evaluation and appraisal and for improvement will be made. These proposals, presented to leaders and members of the club, were to serve as the basis of study and subsequent action.

RAICHUR, SUNDERRAJ S. *Religion in Public Education in India*. Ph.D., Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts. 1948. 240 pages.

*Sponsoring Committee:* Walter G. Muel-dar, chairman, R. J. Taylor, Eddy Asirvatham.

*Problem and Limits:* The object of this dissertation is to discover the place of religion in public education in India. The three major issues faced in the study are the nature and meaning of religion, of learning processes, and of the separation of church and state (religion and politics). Various proposals and practices of religionists and secularists are also evaluated.

*Procedure:* The method of study is historical and comparative. The place of religion in public education in India has been evaluated from the very early times to the present day. The gradual growth of the principle of the separation of church and state, especially as it developed in the United States of America, is traced.

*Findings and Conclusions:* Ten basic standards have emerged out of this study for evaluation of any proposal or practice. They are: 1. The principle of the separation of church and state (religion and politics) must be maintained. 2. It is the duty of the state to maintain a public school system where there is complete separation of the church and state (religion and politics). 3. Freedom of religion demands the right of any private agency to maintain its own parochial schools without any aid of tax money, except for state aid for the so-called "welfare service." 4. The public schools should recognize that religion is a vital part of any culture. It should be integrated in the program of studies at the functional level. 5. It is the duty of the religious sects to teach their scriptures, ways of worship, and prayer. 6. Religious education must take into consideration the nature of the child and the nature of the growth process. 7. Religious education must take into consideration the nature of the learning process and the teaching-learning cycle. 8. A public school is not irreligious; on the contrary, it is a great character building agency. 9. The dichotomy of the religious and secular can be removed by a functional concept of religion. 10. Lastly, it is the duty of everyone concerned to help the growing generations to think for themselves and arrive at independent and responsible conclusions, using the highest

operational values in the total culture as the criteria.

The author has proposed ten areas of experience found in the life of the school and outside in which religion operates. He has also proposed a democratic common social faith, a hierarchy of loyalties and some areas of social knowledge and thought. The author suggests that they should be integrated in the total school program.

REES, CONARD NEWTON. *A Survey of the Moral Teachings of the King James Version of the New Testament*. Ph.D., University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska. 1949.

*Sponsoring Committee:* Knute Oscar Broady, chairman, Ralph Chairon Bedell, Leslie L. Chisholm, Frank Ernest Henzlik, Edgar Zavitz Palmer, Oscar Helmuth Werner, Dean Amory Worcester.

*Problem and Limits:* To identify and classify the moral teachings found in the King James Version of the New Testament.

*Procedure:* In the study, the New Testament was examined with the view to finding the moral teachings not concerned with sectarianism and theological doctrine. The classification of the moral teachings discovered was made for the purpose of organizing them under the broad objectives commonly accepted as the goals in American education: Citizenship in a democracy, world citizenship, family living, personal development, health and physical fitness, recreation, social living, and economic living. Moral teachings were found in the New Testament for all these areas with the exception of the area on recreation.

*Conclusions:* 1. The study reveals a wealth of moral teachings most of which are invaluable to the schools in the improvement and permanent establishment of a morally sound nation.

2. The study reveals that with only a few exceptions the teachings found in the King James Version of the New Testament are applicable today.

3. The study shows clearly that the New Testament strongly emphasizes the worth of a highly moral personality.

4. The study brings to the forefront many moral teachings directed to church officers and members.

5. The study reveals the fact that even though the King James Version of the New Testament is pregnant with moral teachings, it does not provide a sufficiently complete moral guide for present-day society.

6. The study reveals the fact that even though many of the same teachings are repeated a number of times in different sections of the New Testament, few inconsistencies are noted.

7. The study shows that for the most part the teachings found in the King James Version of the New Testament are self-explanatory.

This study is a step forward toward the use of the moral teachings of the New Testament since they have been identified and classified into usable form.

SHOPE, JOHN H. *The Agencies and Techniques Used for Winning New Members For the Protestant Churches in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, in 1947*. Ph.D., University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. 1949. 110 pages.

*Sponsoring Committee:* Lawrence C. Little, chairman; M. C. Elmer, Samuel P. Franklin, J. A. Nietz, R. V. Young.

*Problem and Limits:* The problem was (1) to discover and compare the agencies and techniques used for winning new members to the churches of the study; (2) to show their relationship to such factors as age, sex, early contacts with religion, length of residence in the community, annual drives for new members, and the attitude of the church toward new members; and (3) to determine whether any combination of agency contacts form a distinctive and predominant pattern by which new members come to join the church.

A sample of 1,364 "new" members, taking their first vows of membership in a Protestant Church, was found to be representative of Allegheny County's 1,008 Protestant churches by both denomination and race. New members produced by the cultural processes of the Sunday School were credited to the



church but the statistical analysis was limited to those *won* by the evangelistic outreach of the church.

*Procedure:* The sequence of agency contacts for 93.7 per cent of the new members was received from local pastors. Use of a questionnaire including identical questions and additional items, returned by 33.3 per cent of the available new members, established the reliability of ministers' report.

*Findings and Conclusions:* For every 100 enrolled church members, 3.9 new members were won by the sample churches. The Sunday School accounted for 42.6 per cent of these. Of the remainder, one of ten came of his own accord, one came by marriage, and the remaining eight were won by the church. Thus classified, approximately three new members were *won* for each 200 enrolled members. In 42.7 per cent of the cases, ministers and new members were in

full agreement; 7.6 per cent of the time they were in close agreement; in 27.5 per cent of the replies there was partial agreement; the remaining 22.2 per cent were instances of apparent disagreement.

The seven agencies studied, in the order of their effectiveness, were: (1) the friendliness of individual lay members; (2) the pastoral staff; (3-4) the subsidiary organizations including the educational system of the church; (5) preaching the Word of God; (6) evangelistic visitation campaigns of the church; (7) forms of church publicity.

The most successful sequence of contacts, that accounted for 56.3 per cent of the new members won, begins with a first contact established by a friendly lay member, and is followed by a pastoral contact. The third contact divides almost equally between the subsidiary organizations and the worship preaching service of the church.

---

Under the Fulbright Act, nearly 700 nationals from nine countries will come to the U. S. for study, teaching, or research during 1950-51. According to the State Department, opportunities in U. S. educational institutions are now available to 698 citizens of Belgium, Luxemburg, Burma, Greece, The Netherlands, New Zealand, The Philippines, The United Kingdom, and France. The Fulbright Act authorizes the State Department to use certain foreign currencies and credits acquired through the sale of surplus property abroad for educational exchange programs with other nations. Under its terms 648 Americans will go to the nine countries for which grants are now authorized. Normally, grants are for one academic year, renewable only in exceptional cases. *The Education Digest*, 12/49.

\* \* \* \* \*

MERCY'S JOB  
NEVER  
ENDS



FOR  
YOUR  
RED CROSS

# Significant Evidence

ERNEST M. LIGON

Professor of Psychology, Union College

MYRTLE C. NASH

Research Associate, Union College Character Research Project

*The purpose of this column is to keep religious educators abreast of relevant significant research in the general field of psychology. Its implications for methods and materials in religious education are clear. Religious educators may well take advantage of every new finding in scientific research.*

*Each abstract or group is preceded by an evaluation and interpretive comment, which aims to guide the reader in understanding the research reported.*

*All of these abstracts are from PSYCHOLOGICAL ABSTRACTS, and used by permission of that periodical. The abstract numbers are from Volume 23, 1949.*

Most education is done with the hope that there will be some relatively permanent effect on the child. Here is a study based on a preschool study done fifteen years ago. It is always easy to find early predictors of adult behavior in reminiscence. What if objective methods are used to measure it?

3136. NEILON, PATRICIA. (U. Minnesota, Minneapolis.) SHIRLEY'S BABIES AFTER FIFTEEN YEARS: A PERSONALITY STUDY. *J. genet. Psychol.*, 1948, 73, 175-186.—Personality sketches of 15 children written on the basis of observations made during the first 2 years of life were compared with sketches prepared independently on the basis of tests and ratings given at the age of 17 years. Five judges attempted to match the sketches of 10 boys and 10 judges the sketches of 5 girls. "Both the results of the individual judges and the mean scores of all judges in matching were significant as compared to chance. Following are the conclusions of the investigation. 1. Personality similarities in an individual persist over a period of time. 2. Some individuals are more readily identifiable after a period of time, presumably due to greater uniqueness of personality pattern. 3. The matching technique, utilizing total impression, allows for the demonstration of similarities in personality pattern in the same individual over a period of time."—R. B. Ammons.

3677. THORNDIKE, E. J. (Columbia U., New York.) NOTE ON THE SHIFTS OF INTEREST WITH AGE. *J. appl. Psychol.*, 1949, 33, 55.—Thirty-seven men between 23 and over 40 years of age estimated their reactions on certain tendencies at age 12 and at present. Assuming the validity of the testimony, the results show that a person's nature at 12 is prophetic of his nature in adult years in this respect, the median correlation for the 37 cases being .55.—C. G. Browne.

\* \* \*

The next four abstracts have to do with projective techniques. We have included a

number of such reports in previous issues. Probably no psychologist doubts the potential value of projective techniques in personality analysis. Many psychologists are conservative as to the present ability to use them with confidence, especially without very thorough training.

3217. MACHOVER, KAREN. (Kings County Hosp., New York.) PERSONALITY PROJECTION IN THE DRAWING OF THE HUMAN FIGURE. Springfield, Ill.: C. C. Thomas, 1949. ix, 181 p. \$3.50.—This book outlines a method of personality analysis based upon interpretation of drawings of the human figure. "... drawing a person, in involving a projection of the body image, provides a natural vehicle for the expression of one's body needs and conflicts. Successful drawing interpretation has proceeded on the hypothesis that the figure drawn is related to the individual who is drawing with the same intimacy characterizing that individual's gait, his handwriting, or any other of his expressive movements." The principles of interpretation are systematically set forth with respect to the manner of drawing each feature of the head, limbs, body, and clothing; followed by an analysis of the significance of various structural or formal aspects of the drawing, such as symmetry, size, placement, perspective, action, type of line, erasures, shading, etc. Eight pairs of drawings of male and female figures are reproduced and analyzed in detail to illustrate the diagnostic value of the method.—E. M. L. Burchard.

3749. FORER, BERTRAM R. (V. A. Mental Hygiene Clinic, Los Angeles, Calif.) THE FALLACY OF PERSONAL VALIDATION: A CLASSROOM DEMONSTRATION OF GULLIBILITY. *J. abnorm. soc. Psychol.*, 1949, 44, 118-123.—Acceptance by subject or analyst is no proof of correctness of interpretations made from case histories, projective tests, crystal-gazing, or graphology. One week after students filled out the Diagnostic Interest Blank they were given identical generalized personality sketches supposedly based upon the DIB. They

rated the effectiveness of the DIB, the correctness of the entire sketch, and finally the truth of each of the 13 statements in the sketch. Everyone considered the sketch highly accurate. Minimum correspondence with self-evaluation seems to encourage acceptance of a total diagnosis, although specific statements are evaluated more cautiously.—C. M. Harsb.

3764. WITTENBORN, J. R., AND SARASON, SEYMOUR B. (Yale U., New Haven, Conn.) EXCEPTIONS TO CERTAIN RORSCHACH CRITERIA OF PATHOLOGY. *J. consult. Psychol.*, 1949, 13, 21-27.—Many responses allegedly of pathological significance occur in the projections of people whose adjustment is not particularly atypical or pathological. Similarly, individuals known to suffer conspicuously from marked mental pathology are not consistently judged to be appropriately pathological when any particular set of Rorschach response characteristics is employed. Careful statements qualifying the relevance of characteristics of pathology must be prepared; caution should be employed when using any particular Rorschach characteristic as evidence for or against a particular pathology.—S. G. Dulsky.

3915. McCANDLESS, BOYD ROWDEN. (Ohio State U., Columbus.) THE RORSCHACH AS A PREDICTOR OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS. *J. appl. Psychol.*, 1949, 33, 43-50.—Two matched groups of officer candidates, U. S. Maritime Service, differing widely in academic achievement were given individual Rorschachs. The results indicate that an analysis of the conventional Rorschach categories failed to demonstrate any important statistically significant differences between the high point and the low point students. A trend appeared, however, on the mean number of popular responses. Munroe's check list for discriminating good from poor students and Beck's Z or organization score also failed to make discrimination of differences in the groups.—C. G. Browne.



It is unfortunate that the abstracter did not summarize the findings of this study. This is the sort of objective study of which we need far more. We make so many generalizations about what young people think on little or no evidence.

5131. DOWD, M. AMADEUS. (Society of Immaculate Heart of Mary, Monroe, Mich.) CHANGES IN MORAL REASONING THROUGH THE HIGH SCHOOL YEARS. *Stud. Psychol. Psychiat. Cathol. Univ. Amer.*, 1948, 7, (2), 120 p.—A questionnaire consisting of 30 problem situations involving moral questions was administered to 100 Catholic girls in each of grades 8 through 12. The subjects were asked what they would do if confronted by each of 30 problems presented. They were also asked to indicate the reasons for their choice. The resulting reasons were classified as ethical, emotional, or pragmatic. An analysis was made of age changes and characteristic age responses on the basis of each of the 3 classifications. Final conclusions listed 12 trends disclosed by the analysis.—J. E. Horrocks.

Having come to realize that home cooperation is indispensable to effective character education, religious educators will want to know of all methods suggested for getting it.

3120. ALDRICH, C. ANDERSON. (Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minn.) TECHNIQUES FOR INTERESTING A COMMUNITY IN GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN. *Child Developm.*, 1948, 19, 35-39.—The Rochester Child Health Institute, in cooperation with the Mayo Clinic and governmental agencies, is planning a community health program in which the total health of the child, i.e., the physical, mental, and emotional factors, are to be considered. Dissemination of information reaches out to all concerned with child rearing and child development. Parents attend lecture courses on growth and development, supplemented by pamphlet series; the fellows in pediatrics at the Mayo Clinic are required to take 6 months' training at the institute; public health nurses and nurses in training receive practical training at the institute, and nursery school and public school teachers are invited to attend weekly seminars on a wide variety of topics. This unique program has been in operation since January 1, 1944, but numerous unsolved problems are still to be worked out.—E. W. Gruen.



This is a study from the field of Group Dynamics. One of their most significant areas of research has to do with leadership. If they can pull in from the area of the mystical and give us some objective facts about it, the results will be highly significant.

3684. MEREL, FERENC. GROUP LEADERSHIP AND INSTITUTIONALIZATION. *Hum. Relat.*, 1949, 2, 23-39.—The question raised by this study is: "Which is stronger, the group made up of individuals of average social penetration, or the individual of a high degree of social penetration but alien to the group?" This is asked specifically with respect to the relationship between leader and group. First, same-sex children from a day nursery "whose social qualities were an average for that nursery group and who were not leaders" were selected after a two-week observation period. These average qualities were: (1) following orders predominant; (2) imitation predominated over being imitated; (3) group play and cooperation average in frequency; and (4) "acts of attacking, crying, telling on each other were . . . average." These children then formed a new group and were placed in a separate room. "A leader was placed in the group so formed," after the new group developed its own traditions and rituals, from 3 to 6 meetings usually. Twelve groups were used and the "power of penetration" of 26 "leaders," who were children so designated by nursery school teachers and observers in this study, was determined. In most cases the leader adopted the new group's traditions rather than instilling his own but, while " . . . he proved weaker than the group, he still managed to play the role of leader." Finally, there is developed the notion of the marginal individual, a retiring person who is first drawn to

the newly-introduced leader and becomes a vehicle of interpreting him to the group, and the group to him. — R. A. Littman.



Here are more reports to add to the evidence from the relatively new field of psychosomatic medicine. It is to be hoped that this type of research will not reach the level of a fad until enough work of a critical nature has been done to make it possible with some degree of insight.

3356. BENJAMIN, JOHN D., COLEMAN, JULES V., & HORNBEIN, RUTH. (Nat. Jewish Hosp., Denver, Colo.) A STUDY OF PERSONALITY IN PULMONARY TUBERCULOSIS. *Amer. J. Orthopsychiat.*, 1948, 18, 704-707. — Sixteen tubercular patients, 10 of whom had their first breakdown within a year after admission to the hospital, were studied over a year's time by psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers. The group showed a high incidence of psychopathology. The only pre-tuberculous personality features common to most of the subjects were dependency conflicts or relatively uninhibited dependency strivings. Concerning the relationship of personality to the course of the disease, inhibited hostility seemed to exert an unfavorable influence while the capacity to express conscious hostility had a favorable influence. — R. E. Perl.



3367. RIPLEY, HERBERT S., WOLF, STEWART, & WOLFF, HAROLD G. TREATMENT IN A PSYCHOSOMATIC CLINIC. *J. Amer. med. Ass.*, 1948, 138, 949-951. — A total of 889 patients with bodily disturbances and emotional reactions occurring as part of responses to adverse life situations were treated in an out-patient clinic. Of this number 690 were followed for more than one year. Various types of psychotherapeutic procedures were used from reassurance and emotional support to fairly extensive deep analysis. It was considered that at least 20% showed definite and lasting improvement, and symptomatic improvement was evident in over half the number. An average of only 9 hours per patient was spent. The most important therapeutic force seemed to be the ability of the physician and the clinic to help the patient to recognize and deal constructively with the problems. — C. M. Louttit.



3364. LEWIS, NOLAN D. C. (Columbia U., New York.) PSYCHOSOMATIC PRINCIPLES AND PATTERNS IN DISORDERS OF THE SPECIAL SENSES. *Psychoanal. Rev.*, 1948, 35, 411-439. — "As the mind represents the total activity of the organism it is accepted generally that one should expect to find emotional and sometimes intellectual dysfunctions associated with structural and physiological alterations in the various organs of the body." Three cases of peripheral hyperalgesic neurosis are represented and discussed as to psychodynamics.

When analyzed down to fundamentals ego psychology and psychosomatic medicine differ only semantically. Sixteen references. — D. Prager.



The trend in contemporary social science toward studies which cut across the traditional boundaries between the different sciences is one of which religious educators should be keenly aware. Within the last few years the research in anthropology has had especially strong influence in social psychology. The following reports are all related to this trend.

3172. COOK, L. A. (Wayne U., Detroit, Mich.) INTERGROUP EDUCATION. *Rev. educ. Res.*, 1947, 17, 266-278. — The best designation for the development of goodwill among associations of individuals is "inter-group education," rather than "intercultural education," "educating for better human relations," or similar expressions. After defining intergroup education and discussing research approaches, the author proceeds to analyze recent studies dealing with the process of socializing children, the nature and control of prejudiced attitudes, the conflicting role of the school as a reducer of ethnic tensions on the one hand and as the transmitter of community bias patterns on the other, and the techniques of group management. The function of the researcher is "to assist in the understanding of intergroup relations in and about the school, to analyze their effects on individuals and the community, and where possible, to bring these behaviors by experimental action into line with democratic ideals." 77-item bibliography. — W. W. Brickman.



3696. FRIED, EDITH G., & LISSANCE, MARJORIE FISKE. THE DILEMMAS OF GERMAN YOUTH. *J. abnorm. soc. Psychol.*, 1949, 44, 50-60. — Prospects of democratizing German youth were appraised by interviewing 225 young men and women, aged 18 to 28, of a town in the American zone. Questions dealt with social attitudes and personal outlook. Despite economic scarcity, laborers and professionals are equally interested in marriage and raising a family. Men want to be master of the household, with wives who are good housekeepers. Women want husbands to "understand" them and be good providers. Both sexes want partners who feel just like themselves about everything. Case studies illustrate the common inability to compromise or to adjust to differences of opinion. Sixty-eight percent believe in training children by punishment, shaming, or contempt. Although half of the respondents professed to favor democratic government, they had no conception of grass-roots democracy. They want to be governed from afar by strong leaders. Strong ties are with the "Fatherland," not with their neighbors. Nearly half of the sample desired to emigrate; and only the veterans wanted to see Germany involved in another war. Responsibility for War II is evaded, but there is willingness to admit their political immaturity, deference to authority, and inability of compromise. — C. M. Harsh.

# THE BIBLE AND MODERN BELIEF

by

Louis Wallis

Our belief in One God—was it impressed upon ancient Israel at the beginning of the national history and symbolized by the priestly "Tabernacle in the Wilderness"? Or did our belief in God come into the world through an evolutionary process involving Divine Immanence? The antithesis "Tabernacle or Evolution" is focal to the struggle of modern Biblical scholarship to grasp its fundamental problem.

Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* emphasizes that progressive Biblical investigators had given up the historicity of the priestly Tabernacle at the beginning of the present century. This view had only the status of a learned opinion as long as the priestly material in the Bible continued to be interpreted merely as a document of generalized priestly significance.

This new book, which grows out of the author's earlier volumes, reveals for the first time that the Priestly Source in the Bible is anti-Ephraimite and weighted meticulously against the legendary Ephraimite mother, Rachel; that it is pro-Judaic and carefully compiled in favor of Leah, the legendary mother of Judah; and that it reaches us through the "bottleneck" of post-exilic scribalism.

Hebrew history comes into view as a course of events in which Ephraim (the original Israel) is primary to the evolution of monotheism as expressed in the ministries of Elijah and Hosea, supplemented by Amos, whose work was in Ephraim. The destruction of Ephraim throws the burden and mission of Israel upon the single tribe of Judah, whose priestly scribes naturally build the Bible in terms of Judaic interests.

After four centuries of necessary priestly rule, the reassertion of prophetic social emphasis by Jesus is followed by the necessary but individualistic work of Paul. The struggle within modern Judaism and Christianity is to combine the social and individual phases of religion into a logical body of belief.

\$2.50

(Order directly from the publisher)

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Box 6697 College Station

Durham, North Carolina



## BOOK REVIEWS

*Before You Marry.* By SYLVANUS M. DUVALL. With a Foreword by Evelyn Millis Duvall. New York: Association Press, 1949. ix + 171 pages. \$2.50.

The author's wife, well-known for her work with the National Council on Family Relations, presents her husband's work with justifiable pride. Dr. Duvall has taken 101 questions, which more than twenty years of experience has taught him concern young people contemplating marriage, and answered them with a combination of discernment and interpretation of scientific studies and clinical evidence. To his knowledge of the social sciences and of religion he has brought personal satisfaction in his own marriage. And if Dr. Duvall counsels young people as well as he writes (which I daresay is the case), it is small wonder that thousands of youth have looked to him in the past for help as they approach the marriage altar.

This book will make a splendid companion volume for use with *When You Marry*, by Evelyn Millis Duvall and Reuben Hill. Teachers, Christian Association secretaries, ministers and young people themselves will do themselves a favor by buying *Before You Marry*; and, having bought it, there can be no question but that they will use it. Do you want to know how to investigate a prospective mate and your near-in-laws? Are you concerned with adjustment for a lasting marriage? Are you really ready for marriage, and how suitable are you for each other?

To older people, bent on helping young people: Do you wish to improve your handling of questions which young couples commonly ask? Have you a proper regard for the mental health aspect of marriage? How would you like to examine Dr. Duvall's excellent thinking about suitable ways to handle crises—loss of love, adultery, death?

Once you have the book in hand you have clear and wise reading matter which makes you want to know Dr. Duvall and watch him work.—*Wesner Fallaw*, Professor of Religious Education, Andover Newton Theological School.

\* \* \*

*World Faith.* By RUTH CRANSTON. New York: Harper & Bros., 1949. 193 pages. \$3.00.

Here is a book which very much deserves to be read and studied in the churches. Some will not like it because it finds too much good in non-Christian religions and might be thought, therefore, to undermine the sense of urgency on the part of the Christian church to carry out its world mission, but it does present material which Christians ought to know. There is a fundamental basis underlying all of the religions herein studied which might well furnish a common foundation upon which a world of peace and good will might be erected. Certainly Christians ought to want just that. If for example one could find throughout the world of Buddhism a hatred of violence and love for peace should not the Christian eagerly take advantage of it? If likewise in the religions of China and in India such principles, even though not actually practiced in

those lands, should he not eagerly seek to make capital of them? His known practices must recognize lying far beyond the nobler ideas of Jesus. Yet, it is Jesus teaching an ideal which he wants to see realized. May it not be true in other lands that there are those who are eager to get back of the sectarian and dogmatic later accretions upon the finer, more profoundly spiritual and ethical teaching of other great religious founders? Should this be true, might he not with greater confidence seek through co-operation with people of other lands the ideal of a world of brotherhood and peace.

Here, it seems to me, is a good book that religious educators might make a good deal of use out of, particularly with adult groups and young people's groups in other churches. A reading of the book by officers and teachers of the church schools might be a very real contribution toward the attainment of the so much desired peace and good will among men.—*Charles S. Braden*, Professor of History and Literature of Religions, Northwestern University.

\* \* \*

*Bearing Witness to the Truth.* By HAROLD COOKE PHILLIPS. New York and Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949. 219 pages. \$2.50.

In harmony with the great tradition of the Lyman Beecher Lectureship, under whose aegis this book was produced, Dr. Phillips has taken a great theme, important to philosophy and life, and related it to the specific problems of preaching. He has handled his subject with the sure touch of competent thinking, made as luminous with concrete statement and apt illustration as all good preaching should be.

The initial chapter defining truth, and its successor relating truth to moral reality, are especially valuable for the robust incisiveness of their examination of contemporary life. Maintaining that truth is objective, and so the keystone of all relationships; one, and hence universal; indestructible, and therefore deeply related to belief in God, Dr. Phillips sets forth a conception of truth that sharply challenges the moral relativity and secularism of our time.

Declaring that moral reality is the deepest truth, the Lyman Beecher lecturer seeks to trace the origin of the moral sense, and finds occasion to take issue with the current notion that it is the product of nature or society. To T. H. Green's dictum that "No individual can make a conscience for himself. He always needs a society to make it for him," Dr. Phillips replies: "the difficulty with such a statement is that when you make society the creator of morality you inevitably make society morally irresponsible and so open the door for tyranny, since society then becomes the ultimate. In such an event society brings the individual to judgment, but nothing or no one brings society to the bar of judgment. It judges, but itself is never judged." The content of morality is a social product, he concludes, but the moral sense itself is inherent in man's spiritual kinship to God. Theology is at its

best only when it keeps close to the sense of moral obligation.

The lecture on "Ways of Knowing Truth" leaves much to be desired as a handling of philosophy's epistemological problem, but says a number of things of real practical importance. On "The Sermon and the Truth" Dr. Phillips offers some helpful methodological tips for the preacher, and lights up the whole subject delightfully with a fresh use of Melville's picture of Father Mapple's preaching in *Moby Dick*. A closing chapter on "Christ the Truth" reaches bracing heights in its delineation of Christ as the embodiment of truth as personal, a unique insight of Christianity. Being personalized truth, Christ is also the truth about persons. Having thought successively of science, politics, and economics as the messiahs of a new world, we must come to understand that a new world can come only as man is recreated; and this we can expect only as truth grown personal and redemptive of persons has access to us.

These are not lectures on preaching in the narrowly vocational sense, but for any thoughtful person stimulating reading, and devotional in the sense of being sharply challenging to complacency and creating a mood of "hospitality to the highest."—*Merrill R. Abbey, First-University Methodist Church, Madison, Wisconsin.*



*Characteristically American.* By RALPH BARTON PERRY. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1949. x + 162 + v pages. \$3.00.

The American principle of self-government requires each generation of Americans to ask of themselves the famous question which Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur asked of himself in 1782: "What is an American?" His answer no honest American can forget. America is not a Europe, composed of "great lords who possess everything, and of a herd of people who have nothing." "Here are no aristocratical families, no courts, no kings, no bishops, no ecclesiastical dominion, no invisible power giving to a few a very visible one . . . We are all animated with the spirit of an industry which is unfettered and unrestrained, because each person works for himself . . . The American is a new man, who acts upon new principles; he must therefore entertain new ideas, and form new opinions." That, in 1782.

Now, in 1949, in an entire world of men and women, a "concrete universal" (p. 72), who engage themselves and who are engaged, both openly and covertly, in all of the strategies and intrigues which they hope will bring to power their own perspective and particular world-views and faiths, Professor Ralph Barton Perry, in *Characteristically American*, again asks, for our generation, de Crèvecoeur's question. He answers it in these five William W. Cook lectures which he delivered at the University of Michigan in 1948.

His answer is as fully informed, as prophetic, mature, and as wise as any we are likely to find compressed in one-hundred sixty pages. Perhaps the compression makes it all the better. After reading his book, one rejoices that this nation has reached its manly independence, in principle, and understands the assaults which the enemies of its democracy make on its ways. In the end, Professor Perry's answer joins de Crèvecoeur's: America does

not need the European-inspired authoritarian paternalism, of varieties either to the left or the right, which are now so generously preached as ways of salvation for both our free individuals and our free society. Americans, at best, are not institutionally subdued and coerced men and women. Americans, at best, are both inwardly and outwardly responsible and creative.

Professor Perry's own phrase for the distinctively American way is *collective individualism*, a leitmotif for the book which merits nine clusters of page citations in the Index. *Collective individualism* he defines as the conscious philosophy which endorses the claims of men and women to be "masters and beneficiaries of social institutions; and which credits them with a hand in the making of history" (p. 37).

The many ramifications of this theme Professor Perry explores with clear understanding and good sense. In contrast to all forms of authoritarianism, secular or ecclesiastical, the essence of Americanism is not a levelling down but a levelling up, the achievement of effort, discipline, and talent (pp. 150-151). *Collective individualism*, or Americanism, "is government by the consent of individuals, government for the benefit of individuals, the moral responsibility of the individual, the individual's autonomy through the possession of a reason and conscience of his own, the appeal from the positive law imposed by government to a higher law imposed on each individual by his own faculties" (p. 42)—the fully grown and developed individual as an end and not as a means of implementing another's will. *Collective individualism* is concrete particularism, dynamic pluralism, moral humanism, practical optimism (p. 86). *Democracy* is "a social group organized and directed by all of its members for the benefit of all of its members" (p. 127). In their creed of collective individualism, Americans fuse self-responsibility with humanitarianism (pp. 64-69), "individual responsibility, coöperation, intelligence, love, kindness, generosity, sympathy, and the Golden Rule" (p. 159).

This is no utopian vision. Professor Perry is not unaware of counter-techniques and counter-ideologies which oppose American collective individualism. The vast increase of media of communication which are used ruthlessly in an effort to control both the emotions and the thought of men and women, propaganda, censorship, inquisition (pp. 138-146); the tendency within higher education to capitulate to the tabloid mind (p. 142); predatory breed and selfishness; the self-seeking, self-assertive, aggressive arrogance of ignorance and of office (pp. 139)—all of these have beaten in upon his consciousness without fading or melting away his solid, persevering insistence on the integrity of democracy as a moral society. Democracy has its own comprehension of the differences between retributive and distributive and punitive and social justice, between permissive and enabling rights (pp. 152-154). These principles he sees as operative in all expressions of human values, institutional and individual.

His fourth lecture, "The American Religious Heritage," is required reading for all religious leaders who understand and are honestly concerned not only with the question of the place of the United States in Christendom, of political democ-

racy and Christian ethics, but also with Paul Tillich's criticism that the churches themselves "are too much bound by their traditional forms, on the one hand, and by their amalgamation with the present structure of society on the other hand" (*The Protestant Era*, p. 267). Professor Perry's observations on the problem of Roman Catholicism as a world-view and a faith operative within a free society of free men are as succinct and penetrating as any which have come into the current discussions:

Catholicism is uncongenial to Americanism in its authoritarianism, and in the passive obedience which this implies; in its basing of civil polity and secular morality on specific religious doctrines, attributed to revelation and involving a supernaturalistic metaphysics; in its claim of doctrinal infallibility; in its ultimate uniformitarian goal; in its disposition to use the agencies of the state for the promotion of a specific religious creed and worship. (p. 124)

Professor Perry's book is informative, incisive, and mature. It will remind its readers anew that one good book requires another. Professor Perry's good book establishes criteria which Americans may use in appraising the quality of their democracy. It remains for other good books, by applying these criteria to our national decisions and commitments, to tell us precisely what we ourselves are now permitting to happen in this world, towards what goals we are moving, and where we shall actually be when and if we reach them. Professor Perry's answer to Van Wyck Brooks is final. Contrary to the latter's statement that Americans have lowered democracy to the valley, Professor Perry affirms that genuine Americans, in their collective individualism, have placed democracy "on the heights close to the Kingdom of Heaven" (p. 67). —Warren Taylor, The Department of English, Oberlin College.



*The Bible and Modern Belief; A Constructive Approach to the Present Religious Upheaval.* By LOUIS WALLIS. Durham, N. C. Duke University Press, 1949. xiii+176 pages. \$2.50

The author of this little volume seeks to clarify for his reader the social and spiritual evolution of man which underlies the formation of the Biblical literature. At the same time he is anxious to show that by laying the Bible open to relentless scientific inquiry, one need not impair its religious impact. Rather scientific research may enhance the message of the Bible for the modern mind. This is a familiar theme to serious biblical students these days, and few would be out of sympathy with Wallis' approach. The book seems to be addressed to the lay reader for the most part, and is written in a popular and often lively style. Yet the volume also has certain scholarly pretensions. For the author presents a mass of detailed arguments for a number of positions unique in scientific biblical studies. Underlying this detailed discussion may be recognized the writer's fundamental desire to show that the modern bias against supernaturalistic biblical theology, and all that smacks of orthodoxy, has a basis in the very history of biblical origins.

Wallis uses Wellhausen's reconstruction of Israelite history as a spring-board. But he is not content with Wellhausen's relatively mild antipathy

to post-exilic Judaism. The Wellhausenist view that the Priestly materials of the Pentateuch (P) were manufactured from whole cloth by late Jewish scribes is accepted and embellished. Indeed Wallis is not satisfied until he goes on to discard the Yahwistic document (J) as a true source. J like P is rather a late-Jewish manipulator of old Ephraimite (E) tradition. Wellhausen's generally accepted formula, JEDP, is blandly set aside in favor of a new formula, EDJP (sic!). This revision is based, by and large, on an alleged antagonism towards old Ephraim on the part of Jewish redactors. All that is archaic and creative is attributed to Ephraim. The sole contribution of the "Jews" was the preservation of the old heritage after the demise of Ephraim. Even this contribution is qualified by the distortion of Israelite history to the benefit of Judah by bitterly jealous Jewish scribes.

So we are told that Moses was an Ephraimite. There was no tribal organization in the time of the Judges and indeed the tribe of Judah had no real existence until the time of David. Monotheism is the product of the spirit of Ephraimite prophecy. All this has been disguised in the received "Judaized Bible." It is the talk of scholarship to disengage pristine biblical tradition from the grip of the Judaizers. One suspects that most of this discussion is more eloquent in revealing the author's antipathy to ancient Judaism (as well as to orthodox Christianity), than in proving an all-pervasive antipathy of the Jews toward their Ephraimite precursors.

We cannot set about refuting the author's detailed arguments in a short review. Perhaps it may be well, however, simply to indicate one or two of a number of weaknesses in Wallis' discussion.

Wallis' reconstruction of the Period of the Judges, alluded to above, is crucial to his argument. Yet to judge from his volume, he is unacquainted with the epoch-making studies of this period by Alt, Noth, and Albright. It has been shown to be well nigh certain that Israel during the period of the Judges was organized into a loose Yahwistic confederation around a covenant sanctuary, and that this amphictyonic organization was built on a twelve-tribe system. This is not to say that the tribes were counted the same way in all periods. They were not. But the evidence is clear that a powerful Judah tribe was an important member of the early Israelite amphictyony.

Moreover, it is not permitted to Wallis to lay aside J as an easy sacrifice to his reconstruction of early Israelite history. The priority and centrality of J in the Tetrateuch is one of the most firmly fixed points of modern criticism. The sober and learned researches of Rudolph and Volz, to mention only one of a multitude of pertinent studies, should in any case have given Wallis pause.

And so we might go on. It is enough to say that scholars, particularly those who control extra-biblical sources, are coming increasingly to the view that the part played by Jewish manipulation of early traditional materials was much exaggerated by Wellhausen. Thus the position of Wallis becomes doubly untenable.

The Old Testament scholar will be amazed to find in this book no allusion to German scholarship since 1878. It is difficult not to conclude that the author has no first-hand knowledge of the rich

literature of recent years on the very subjects with which he deals.—*Frank M. Cross, Jr.*, Johns Hopkins University.

\*\*\*

*Christianity and Communism.* By JOHN C. BENNETT. New York: Association Press, 1948. 128 pages. \$1.50.

Much of the persistent confusion about communism among students, teachers and clergymen in America would disappear if Professor Bennett's forthright and refreshing book were widely read. The author makes a penetrating critique of Christianity's most verile antagonist in words that laymen can understand. At the outset he states his viewpoint: "This book is written by one who believes that Communism as a faith and as a system of thought is a compound of half-truth and positive error, that Communism as a movement of power is a threat to essential forms of personal and political freedom, and that it is the responsibility of Christians to resist its extension in the world." (p. 9)

The author, who teaches social ethics at Union Theological Seminary, does not criticize Communism as an apologist of the status quo or as one in league with the past, but as one who sees in the movement a challenge for Christians "to be true to the revolutionary implications of their own faith." (p. 9) The gospel demands radical social change, but the methods must not violate the integrity of individual persons.

Chapter II makes a singularly valuable contribution in a revealing three-fold analysis—communism as a promise of a new order, communism as an interpretation of life, and communism as a revolutionary method. This world-wide movement falls short of the Christian ethic in its assertion of atheistic absolutism, in its methods of dealing with foes, and in the ultimate status which it accords to persons.

Unlike many other books, this well-documented volume does not deal alone with theoretical Marxism, but with contemporary communist practice as well. It is up-to-date, relevant, stimulating. *Christianity and Communism* is a Haddam House Book, the sixth of a series, sponsored by the Hazen Foundation, Women's Press (YWCA), and Associated Press (YMCA). It deserves the widest possible study.—*Ernest Lefever*, Divinity School, Yale University.

\*\*\*

*The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels.* By ALEXANDER HEIDEL. 2d ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949. ix + 269 pages. \$5.00

S. N. Kramer has called the Gilgamesh epic probably the most significant piece of creative writing in the ancient Near East, and Heidel calls it the Odyssey of the Babylonians and the longest and most beautiful Babylonian poem yet discovered. Most people are most familiar with that portion of the epic in which the flood story occurs. Heidel devotes 86 pages of his book just to the translation of the twelve tablets of the epic, and that without including all the available materials. See, more recently, S. N. Kramer, "Gilgamesh and Agga," in *The American Journal of Archaeology*, LIII (1949), pp. 1 ff. Heidel presents a brief but excellent introduction to the translation of the epic,

relating the discovery and publication of the tablets, and describing the contents, theme, sources and age of the epic. There follows a chapter on related materials, giving the translations of two Sumerian deluge versions, the Old Babylonian deluge tale (the Atrahasis epic), in so far as these are preserved, and the deluge account of Berossus, adding the poem of Ishtar's descent to the underworld. The general student of religion will appreciate having these in this handy form from one as competent as the author.

Heidel, perhaps somewhat too narrowly, interprets the theme of the Gilgamesh epic to be a meditation on death, but this explains the inclusion of a long chapter (87 pages) on death and the afterlife. This chapter is particularly important for its excellent presentation of Mesopotamian views of the origin and nature of death, burial customs, the realm of the dead, and the resurrection of the dead, in connection with which he also discusses the Hebrew viewpoints. The reviewer knows no more adequate or competent discussion of the Mesopotamian viewpoints. Heidel uses both epigraphic and anepigraphic sources, and for the former draws in part on the valuable files for the Oriental Institute Assyrian dictionary, and many important textual sources are quoted. The reviewer disagrees largely with Heidel's interpretation of the Hebrew beliefs and the Old Testament data. The interpretation of Ecclesiastes' attitude toward death, especially 3:16-22, is not convincing. Nor does it appear from 2 Kings 22:20 that Josiah was made to die in order that he might not witness the destruction of Jerusalem. Even less convincing are the arguments that subterranean Sheol is the abode of the souls of the wicked only, and that God takes the souls of the righteous to heaven. Certainly Ps. 73:23-26 is dubious evidence. The author emphasizes the fact that, in contrast with Mesopotamia, in ancient Israelite Palestine no food traces have been found in vessels placed in tombs, but he should have noted that the same is true of Canaanite tombs, as the source he quotes does note, and it is most uncertain how this fact is to be interpreted. The final chapter discusses the flood story. Although it contains many good things, the reviewer is not convinced by the attempt to explain away the "alleged contradictions" in the Hebrew flood story.

The great contribution of the volume lies in the unusually fine presentation and interpretation of the Mesopotamian materials, and this alone makes the book valuable. An index would add much to the usability of the book. There are numerous and useful footnotes. The book reproduces the type-written page.—*Herbert G. May*, Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College.

\*\*\*

*Jews in Transition.* By ALBERT I. GORDON. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1949. xviii + 331 pages. \$4.00.

*Jews in Transition* is a fascinating and illuminating book. The author was rabbi of a Conservative congregation in Minneapolis for many years and is now Executive Director of the United Synagogue of America, the national organization of the Conservative Jews of the United States.

The book has interest for the sociologist, Chris-



tian or Jew, because it reveals the changes that have taken place in the thinking, feeling and conduct of three generations of Minneapolis Jews as life and the spirit of the country acted upon them. It is the first attempt so far as I know to make an objective study of these changes. That Minneapolis is the community under observation is unimportant. It could be any city in the middle west. That the group studied is Jews should not circumscribe the book's audience nor its claim to earnest consideration by the social scientist interested in American trends. These people happen to be Jews. A study of other groups would probably reveal changes in custom and attitude under the impact of our American environment.

Part III, "There Are These Generations" in which a grandfather, his child and his grandchild express their opinions is as dramatic as a play and as compelling as a good novel.

In his last chapter "Living in Two Cultures" Dr. Gordon indicates the effect which the Nazi persecutions and the birth of Israel have had upon many American Jews. The dilemma which a militant Jewish nationalism that pours out of Palestine into American Jewish communities is only suggested. Many Jews are beginning to see that Jewish nationalism is no surrogate for Jewish faith—for Judaism. Yet the persistence of anti-Semitism is a profound influence with which the social scientist must reckon in any appraisal of the future of Jew and Judaism in America.

Dr. Gordon closes his stimulating volume with these words: "His"—that is the Jews—"desire to accommodate his religious and cultural life to the culture of the majority while avoiding complete assimilation—that is loss of identity—will make his task difficult indeed. But the goal is worthy of his effort."—*Morris S. Lazaron*, Pikesville, Maryland.



*Great Missionaries to the Orient.* By J. THEODORE MUELLER. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1948. 133 pages. \$1.50.

*Great Missionaries to the Orient* is the third in the "Great Missionary" series by Dr. Mueller, a professor of doctrinal and exegetical theology of Concordia Seminary. In the first three chapters the author traces the missionary movement in Japan, Formosa, and Korea: how it started, how it developed, and how the Christian forces are working today in those lands; however, the main portion of the book is on Japan. Eight chapters are devoted to pioneer missionaries to Japan, such as Rimitsu, the Nestorian physician, Francis Xavier, James Curtis Hepburn, James Robin Brown, Channing Moore Williams, Guido Herman Fridolin Verreck, Ivan Kasatkin (more familiar as Nicolai), John Hyde DeForest. These great men of God identified themselves with the native life and became a great power in making Japan a modern civilized nation. The following three chapters are on the missionaries to Korea: Robert Samuel Mackay, Horace Grant Underwood, George Leslie Mackay. In the remaining chapters of the book, the writer gives brief accounts of four Japanese native Christian leaders: Joseph Hardy Nijijima, Asahiro Muramatsu, Taichiro Morinaga, and Mrs. Nobu Jo, and the three Korean leaders, Yun Tchi Ho, Helen K. Kim, and the story of old lady Sim Ssi.

As the author says in his foreword, his intention is to "make Christians to consecrate themselves anew to the great mission cause of Christ." The chief value of the book lies in his simple narrative style in presenting an urge for the great "Gospel Campaign." His speaks on the missionary work with such vigor and enthusiasm that he sometimes confuses fact with fiction. Here I quote a few examples: He refers to Romans 10:18 and Colossians 1:6, saying, "Certainly it is not incredible that the Gospel might have reached India, China and Japan by the year 300 A.D. or even earlier, so that in the fifth or sixth century when the Nestorians began their trek east, they were guided by definite Christian legends and tradition" (p. 46). He also says, though half doubtfully, "it is remarkable, too, that the wife of Emperor Shomu, brilliant Empress Komyo, bore the little 'Light and Illumination' which was the official name by which the Christian doctrine was known in China at that time." According to his assumption, Rimitsu, the Nestorian physician, reached Japan by 724 and "established himself at the court of the emperor and won the Empress to the Christian faith (pp. 46-47)." As for the pagan religions in Japan, he has the following to say, "Pagan religion, negatively is nothing else than a fearful groping in spiritual darkness and positively a worship of the power of evil connected with immorality and other shameful vices (pp. 17, 18)." We should keep in mind, however, that Buddhism, for example, is quite the opposite of what the author says, and I don't think that all his readers would agree with his bold statement. In speaking of Japan's territory today, he includes "Sakhalin and Formosa," which Japan lost at the surrender (p. 12). The book is very interesting for those who can separate fact from fictitious elements, but it is quite dangerous for those who do not know the people and culture of those lands.—*Masuko Otaka*, Divinity School, Yale University.



*The Human Venture in Sex, Love, and Marriage.* By PETER A. BERTOCCHI. New York: Association Press, 1949. 143 pages. \$2.50.

Professor Bertocchi states in the preface of his book that he is addressing this essay in right and wrong to "young people who want to work out . . . a reasoned answer to their questions and doubts . . ." He is concerned to present an interpretation "of the main facts and meanings of sex and love in human experience," and he has done this within the space of four chapters. The language is mainly philosophical—which is hardly the best medium for dealing with this subject with college students; and though the author relies on psychological understanding of human relations, and brings in a good portion of Christian ethical insights, when his job of writing is over he has been more successful in demonstrating his competence as a classroom teacher and friendly adviser to youth who are in love (or to youth floundering amid sexual perplexities) than he has in producing a book which will compel a wide reading audience.

Parsons, directors of religious education, and Christian laymen whose fortune it is to help high school seniors find a college would be assured, upon reading *The Human Venture*, that in Professor Bertocchi a student has a teacher and friend well



suited to deal with youthful emotional emergencies engendered by sexual indulgence, real or imagined love, and the question of marriage. In short, the undergraduate in Bertocci's classes in philosophy at Boston University is not merely under safe tutelage but is surely stimulated to view sex in its proper place—as a byproduct of rich relationships in which love is more inclusive than physical gratification and possessiveness. Bertocci's Christian morality is distinctly inoffensive, well reasoned, and the more effective because he does not use it to convict youth of wrong and cudgel them toward what is right. It is out of the overflow of his ethical experience and philosophy of Christian values and conduct that Professor Bertocci speaks in these pages.

Pages seventy-one and following, which offer reasons for pre-marital sexual abstinence, are particularly valuable. In chapter three, "Are We Expecting Too Much of Human Nature?" the author draws on his experience in counseling young people to show how control of sexual desire offers greater assurance of lasting love than does ready expression of sex (pre-marital and extra-marital). He takes into account the arguments and rationalizations of young people who quote certain current literature to support sexual license as a means for avoiding repression. Conscience is seen as a force far more potent than a merely socially induced and unnecessary "watch-dog." Control of impulse and lust is deemed essential for the achievement of greater values inhering in married love.

Perhaps the chief limitation of the book lies in its sketchy treatment of the final phase of *The Human Venture*—marriage. Indeed, of the three aspects of the subject, sex, love and marriage, the first appears to have an undue share of space. But there is an especially good paragraph on page 128 in which Professor Bertocci quickly shows how the courage and faith of a young married couple are tested.

This is not a book for youth in general, and too few college students will give it the careful reading necessary for it to prove beneficial to them.—*Wesner Fallaw*, Professor of Religious Education, Andover Newton Theological School.



*Science and the Moral Life; Selected Writings.* By MAX OTTO. New York: New American Library, 1949. 192 pages. 35c (Mentor Books, 43)

Books by Max Otto are widely read and generally understood. Consequently, the editors of Mentor Books have brought out this pocket edition for commuters and odd-moment readers, for they can profit from such writing without the running start needed in many books. As Eduard Lindeman says in his short preface, "Otto needs no interpreters." Six of the ten chapters are taken from Otto's best-known works, *Things and Ideals* (Holt, 1924) and *The Human Enterprise* (Crofts, 1940). The rest of the anthology, as well as the introductory and concluding essays, is a collection (made by Otto's former colleagues at the University of Wisconsin) of articles and addresses appearing originally in various journals.

Since Otto thinks of philosophy as valuable "in proportion as it furthers the attainment of moral wisdom" (p. 20), the title of this little book cuts across the major theme of Otto's interests. Since

we cannot help trying to "formulate a rational program of conduct" (p. 11), we must bring science to bear on the full orbit of human endeavor (p. 108). "Scientific humanism" which is also a "realistic idealism" remains the banner under which Otto has fought the supernaturalists for the last forty years.

This is a summons to "genuine loyalty to ideals" and the investment of life's satisfactions with "the noblest meaning" (pp. 53, 40). It is a rebellion against stodgy, taboo morality and institutionalized Christianity (p. 147). Furthermore it is a denial of "finality" in any of man's accomplishments, even his science. "Neither science nor religion nor art nor commerce nor any of the specialized forms of human activity is the end of man's endeavor, but a satisfying life for all who may have a life to live" (p. 185). No wonder Professor Otto's classrooms have bulged with students. The freedom and excitement of this forward thrust into life's possibilities draws a crowd.

Yet many religious educators will be troubled by the insistence that truth is "relative" (pp. 19, 159), and that each one must "define . . . the good life for himself" (p. 163). While the warning that we must not dip "an intellectual net into fluid experience and mistake a catch of abstractions for quivering life" (p. 32), is good rhetoric, some apprehension of the tincture of things is presumed even by this warning. Utter relativism in thought is profitless and contradictory. Otto has been a popular leader of a generation which yearned to break up the caked prejudices of its elders. But what to put in their place has not been made plain by other pragmatists, nor by Professor Otto. To advise that we satisfy the longing for satisfaction is perhaps to do no more than say our actions are good because they are our actions, or that one action deserves another. Has this supposedly down-to-earth pragmatism about run its course?

A generation eager with relativism in its eyes, may soon feel fatigue in its limbs, and ennui in its spirit. "We need to be educated in reverence for the human quest" (p. 126), but the genius of Christian education at least has been that man was not on an entirely human quest.—*Louis William Norris*, Professor of Philosophy, DePauw University.



*The Bible and Human Rights.* By KATHRYN W. MACARTHUR. New York: Woman's Press, 1949. 94 pages. \$2.00.

The alleged purpose of this book is the exploration of the teachings of the Bible to determine the principles and ethical emphases which might be called the bases for human rights as outlined in President's Civil Rights Report and the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. The author is consultant to the Economics and Social Council of the United Nations and is connected with the World's YWCA. The book shows that she has been deeply affected by the UN declaration; she feels that the day may come when this declaration will have the same place and value in the future as that now occupied by the Ten Commandments, the words of Israel's prophets, the Sermon on the Mount, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

This little book contains much evidence of deep earnestness and of genuine insights into the biblical

material. Passages from various parts of the Bible are cited and their relevance to the modern statements on human rights is examined briefly. These illuminating insights are valuable and should prove to be useful to teachers and speakers who seek help from the Bible on this important theme. The reviewer, however, wishes for something more—greater devotion to the principle of coherence, for example, for the outline is confused and lacks a broad structure.

It is hard to do what the author tries to do—to cite biblical support for specific rights contained in modern legal or quasi-legal documents. The biblical viewpoint is apt to be missed and elements of repentance, faith, and dependence upon God as the source of man's individual and collective life to be minimized. A more intensive study than this book represents would be needed to show the truly biblical basis for human rights. Yet this study is suggestive and should provoke helpful discussion.—*Otto J. Babb*, Professor of Bible, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Illinois.

★ ★ ★  
*Personalities in Social Reform.* By G. BROMLEY OXNAM. New York and Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950. 176 pages. \$2.00.

The utterances of G. Bromley Oxnam have become the storm center of religious issues in America, especially in the relation of freedom to social responsibility. He exemplifies the thesis that religious leaders who are both committed and competent may exert tremendous power in the secular order. This competence may be of many kinds—social, scientific, administrative, ministerial, political, medical and the like. In *Personalities in Social Reform* Oxnam depicts the life and work of Sidney and Beatrice Webb, Walter Rauschenbusch, David E. Lilienthal, Mohandas K. Gandhi and Albert Schweitzer, relating their spiritual and technical powers to social reform. The book is an amazing success. To a large extent these personalities are allowed to speak for themselves in their own fresh and appealing originality. There is a world-wide scope in the personalities selected and a broad catholicity in the treatment of each. East and West, four continents, and at least three distinctive religious orientations are represented.

Dedicated to Emory S. Bogardus the work is a worthy tribute to one who has sought "to preserve a free society in which free men may in creative cooperation establish justice and brotherhood." This is Bishop Oxnam's best writing to date and reflects his spirit and method of social reform more forcibly than anything which has yet come from his pen.

In an age when men are overimpressed by the impersonal environmental aspects of institutions and movements, Oxnam presents five "case studies" of the crucial role played by great personalities in changing society. The author makes explicit the special religious orientation of each personality in order to indicate how the quest for social change and reform is influenced by religious idealism. This reflects itself not only in the social goals of these outstanding personalities but also in their methods of work and the persistent discipline of their minds and wills. The following quotation from Beatrice Webb is typical of the practical concerns of all the others: "I soon realized that complete detachment from current politics was impracticable unless you

were indifferent to the public welfare, or had come to the conclusion that human society was beyond human control." All of these personalities combined concretely theory and practice by dedicating their theoretical talents to practical objectives. And they thus have made outstanding testimonies of unusual power. No program of social reform can ignore the central role of creative personality. Educators, clergymen, and social workers will all find rich source material in the stimulating essays of this book.—*Walter G. Muelder*, Dean, School of Theology, Boston University.

★ ★ ★  
*From Long Ago and Many Lands; Stories for Children Told Anew.* By SOPHIA L. FAHS. Boston: Beacon Press, 1948. xviii + 205 pages. \$2.50.

Here is a unique collection of forty-one stories for the use of parents and teachers with "children of seven, eight and nine." Intended primarily neither to entertain nor to teach—though both are done incidentally—the collection has as its foremost purpose to bring the child to an appreciation of the common moral and spiritual experiences of peoples of all cultures, races and religions. Folklore and legend, as well as stories from history, are used to this end, but the author has deliberately avoided the use of fairy and miracle tales, which she believes are confusing to younger readers. One exception is made—the birth story of Jesus is told; but in manner of telling and in the fact that the story is paralleled by similar accounts of the births of Buddha and Confucius, the author seeks to hold to her principle.

Stories are concerned with those who "thought quarreling and fighting were the only ways," "discovered ways to a more friendly world," "asked questions everybody wants to ask," "were thought to be too good to be mere human beings," etc. While they include such old favorites as "Damon and Pythias," "The Bell of Atti," and "The Miller, His Boy and the Donkey," a majority of the stories will be new to the average reader.

In some instances the kind of stories used, despite the fact that they are simply and appealingly told, will hold more interest for children of junior age than those who are younger. "Gautama Finds Out for Himself," "Wise King Solomon," and "The Questions of King Milinda" would seem to be such stories.

Far from being just another collection, here is one which, because of the unique purpose it serves, the many little-known stories it includes, and the quality of story-telling it represents, will not be found to duplicate and can be a valuable addition to any library.—*Eleanor E. Stevens*, Boys' and Girls' Library, Oberlin, Ohio.

★ ★ ★  
*The Small Sects in America.* By ELMER T. CLARK. New York and Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949. 256 pages. \$3.00.

Elmer T. Clark, Methodist clergyman and educator, is among the few authorities in America on the complicated subject of American religious sects. This book is a revised edition of one first published in 1937 and is brought up to date and greatly amplified by the patient gathering and shifting of changing material. No one can accuse its author of prejudicial reporting or of lacking in sympathetic understanding. Accuracy marks its every page. His

divisions of the book reveal its organized contents: the sectarian spirit in American Christianity; pessimistic or adventist sects; perfectionist or subjectivist sects; charismatic or pentecostal sects; communistic sects; legalistic or objectivist sects; characteristics of the small sects; egocentric or New Thought bodies; esoteric or mystical bodies. His index lists, roughly five hundred topics; his general index is minute and the bibliography brought to date (with a few notable omissions).

The author's reporting is enhanced—as is C. S. Braden's volume on the same topic *These Also Believe* (Macmillan, 1949)—by actual visitations and personal encounters with representatives of many of the sects. And, rightly, the reporting is done by personal appraisal on the part of the author(s) rather than by the prejudiced testimony of adherents themselves.—*Vergilius Form*, Professor of Philosophy, College of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio.



*Like the Great Mountains*. By JACK FINEGAN. St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1949. 159 pages. \$2.00.

There are books written because the author has something he wants to say. There are also books produced because a writer's previous efforts have found favor and it is thought that another book by the same author would be well received. *Like The Great Mountains* is of the latter kind. This is not to say that it is a bad book, but certainly it is nothing unusual. It is a collection of eighteen religious essays. Some of these essays, such as the one entitled "What is the Grace of God," are quite good although limited in scope. Others are quite average. Some of the material presented is fresh and stimulating. Some, like the illustration of the bundle of sticks which could not be broken while the individual sticks could be easily broken, is, to say the least, a bit "shopworn." All in all, this is a book of the kind that could be compiled by any one of a hundred or so people who make talks to young people and keep a file of their talks. The author has done, and can do again, much more significant writing.

The strength of the book lies in its simplicity and clarity. By an apt use of illustrations and poetry, the use of short sentences, and non-technical language the author makes clear what he wants to say. He makes no pretense of saying very much about any of the many matters that are brought up for consideration. Rather, he makes a few comments and moves on. For instance, in the essay entitled "The Challenge of Modern Youth" he devotes eight lines to presenting the challenge to share economic opportunity more widely. Twenty-one lines are given to the challenge to strive for racial equality, and the entire essay on "How Deep is God's Love" covers six and one-half pages. Obviously, such matters can only be very lightly touched upon in such limited space, and this is all the author intends.

Young people, for whom the book is intended, and others who have not thought very much about religion or read very widely about it will likely find this book helpful. Others will not find much in it that is rewarding.—*Myron Taggart Hopper*, The College of the Bible, Lexington, Kentucky.

*The Ministry*. Edited by J. RICHARD SPANN. New York and Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949. 208 pages. \$2.00.

This book contains lectures delivered at the 29th Annual Conference on Ministerial Training of the Methodist Church at Evanston, Illinois. Among the seventeen lecturers are some of the honored names of the Christian ministry: Henry Sloane Coffin, Joseph R. Sizoo, Russell Henry Stafford, Ralph W. Sockman, Seward Hiltner, Elton Trueblood, Raymundo de Ovies, and Bishop Paul B. Kern. It is an attempt to describe the many facets of the minister's task.

In a sense it is an anthology of the familiar. The requirements of the ministry have been much written about. The "general practitioner" will find little here that he has not met. It is the kind of book a professor of Pastoral Theology might profitably require in an orientation course. Or, a faithful pastor could offer nothing better to a prospective recruit for the ministry from his parish. For it gives in narrow compass as wide a conception of the clergyman's work as the reviewer has seen. Yet, it contains insights as well as perspectives: such as, Dr. Coffin's three simple tests for interpreting a "call"; Dr. Stafford's distinction between evangelism and revivalism; Oscar Olson's tender dissection of religious comfort; Bishop Frank Smith's insistence that ministers fail from inept public relations; Elton Trueblood's practical discussion of how to study; and Bishop Corson's description of a minister's temptations, especially to the "morning slackness," "those feelings of inertia which make the morning leisure usher in a useless day." It is a helpful volume, eye-opening to the novice and worth pondering by the veteran.—*F. Gerald Enley*, Minister, North Broadway Methodist Church, Columbus, Ohio.



*The Education of Free Men; An Essay toward a Philosophy of Education for Americans*. By HORACE M. KALLEN. New York: Farrar, Strauss & Company, 1949. xix+332 pages. \$5.00.

Dr. Horace M. Kallen was born in Germany and brought to America at age of five. He received his B.A. at Harvard and did graduate work at Princeton, Oxford University and Paris. He received his Ph.D. at Harvard in 1908. His teaching activities have included Harvard and the University of Wisconsin. His career as a professor has seen him associated with the New School for Social Research of New York. Many years of reading and thought and experience have gone into the making of his important book on the Education of Free Men. The book is fairly packed with significant information in respect of no end of matters related to the educational process. When he is making a case as in his dealing with the Roman Catholic theory and practice of education, he makes every effort to secure an adequate documentation of his authorities, and he writes with complete fearlessness. Those familiar with the educational positions of Professor John Dewey will see traces of his influence on every page, though there is no attempt to make Professor Dewey responsible for the working out of educational theories of Dr. Kallen. There is a constant effort to relate the educational process to the life of the American Republic and Thomas

Jefferson comes in for enthusiastic approval in these matters. That the educational process should at every moment be closely related to the experiences and the interests of those who are being educated is an important principle for the author of this book. And a very good principle it is. That any system of education which tends to destroy personal appraisal and free choice among the offered alternatives should be repudiated Dr. Kallen vigorously insists through many pages of vivid and incisive writing. The educational process deals not with automata but with exploring minds. Here too the position of the book will receive wide approbation. But Dr. Kallen is inclined to separate these good and fruitful ideas from other ideas equally good and fruitful. Indeed he is so occupied with these positions that he is inclined to scorn all others. And he has a bad habit of caricaturing every point of view which he dislikes. His discussion of Athenian culture is likely to leave a bad taste in the mouth of any classical scholar who has entered into the spirit of his sources. He has no adequate sense of the place of religion in the life of free men. He does not seem to understand that religion can be commanding without becoming coercive. And with all his enthusiasm for freedom he writes about it quite uncritically. He has no real apprehension of the problem of the misuse of freedom. So while Dr. Kallen has written a book which deserves the widest attention and a book for many of whose clearly expressed insights the reader will be deeply grateful, it is a book which deals with a part rather than with the whole, and in so far fails to offer a complete philosophy of education. And one must add that when he writes with his emotions he is a little less convincing than when he writes with his intelligence.—*Lynn Harold Hough*, New York City.



*Sincerely, in Him.* By MARCUS RIEKE. Columbus, Ohio: Wartburg Press, 1949. 140 pages. \$1.50.

The author of this book is the Youth Director of the American Lutheran Church. He has a very high respect for the Christian youth of today. The writer is much aware of the mind of youth.

The old saying "you teach what you are" came to the mind of the reviewer as the eight chapters were meditated upon. Many times the thoughts that were conveyed lacked the personality and consecration of the youth leader. When the presentations were made at youth conferences and assemblies his personal presence was very important in making the lectures effective.

Youth of today would find it very difficult and probably uninteresting to sit through the presentations of Pastor Rieke. They contain many broad religious abstractions to which youth of many communions have not been exposed. If all youth were trained in the catechism like some of our evangelical fellowship groups they would probably be more aware of the terminology in this book.

The prayers used at the end of each chapter seems to place Jesus Christ as the object of worship. Six of the eight prayers begin with such salutations as "O, Jesus, my Savior," "Jesus, my precious Savior" and "Blessed Savior." Two address God as the listener of prayer. Addressing Jesus instead of God in prayer would be somewhat confusing to

the youth of today who have been trained that God is the proper object of worship.

The writer has drawn a great deal upon his rich experiences and the stories and illustrations given help tremendously in his attempt to reveal the importance of youth giving their lives to God and His saving Word.—*Paul H. King*, Minister of Education, Lakewood Methodist Church, Lakewood, Ohio.



*Hindu View of Christ.* By SWAMI AKHILANANDA. New York: Philosophical Library, 1949. 291 pages. \$3.00.

For the Christian unfamiliar with Hindu thought, or schooled in some of the older conventionalized approaches to the studies of the History of Religions and Comparative Religion, this is a very valuable document.

It is the product of a missionary of the Vedanta Society, now resident in Boston. It contains the epitome of the Vedanta patterns of thought expressed in intelligible and excellent writing with references the modern reader can understand. Those of us who are immersed in the history of Indian culture, think of this primarily as the position originally enunciated by Shankara at the beginning of the ninth century, and modified to meet the mind of the twentieth century. It is sometimes termed Neo-Hinduism. The essence of the Vedanta is that there is a common search for non-dual Reality after which all religions are striving. This is the goal and destiny of man—that he should find his home in this reality through a realization of the unity (if not identity) of the individual soul with Brahman. All else has only relative significance.

According to Swami Akhilananda's view, the great geniuses of religion have been those who have realized this unity. Among these, of course, is Jesus, the Christ. His is a pioneering experience available to all men with the proper ethical, intellectual, and spiritual disciplines. We usually think of these disciplines under the name of Yoga, which we continue to insist on misunderstanding in the West. One of these Yogas is that of self-forgetting devotion. According to the Vedantist the highest of disciplines is Jñāna Yoga, which is the intuitive realization of the destiny of man in God. The moral and devotional disciplines, based on the religions and their teachings, are in the realm of preparation for the ultimate realization. The differences between religions, therefore, are ultimately accidental and rest in local mores and culture. This means that Christianity holds the possibility of one approach to reality, but in the realization of that reality it is at one with all of the other religions of the world.

One would expect that Swami Akhilananda would appreciate Christian writings and Christian missionary activity which is understanding and sympathetic with this fundamental premise. He quotes sympathetically a number of Christian Indians, such as Dr. Kumarappa and Mr. Chenchiah, and Christian leaders such as Dr. E. Stanley Jones and Dr. Rufus Jones. His most rousing denunciations are directed toward those who think in terms of no relativity whatsoever in Christianity, but an uncompromising uniqueness. This includes, of course, theologians of the neo-orthodox schools of all shades, as well as the older, uncritical orthodoxy.



Swami Akhilananda, while distressed about some activities and conceptions of Christian missions, and even more profoundly distressed about the materialism of many of his Indian countrymen, is concerned that Christian missionary activity continue, and that we accept as a contribution to our culture the Hindu missionaries in the United States.

The reverence that is everywhere indicated for Christ is typical of Hindu attitudes toward Him. The impression that his followers will make on India, according to Swami's view, may be summarized in the following quotations:

"The real representatives of Hinduism, Christianity, and other religions can exchange ideas and ideals and live a life of personal integration. This very method will act as direct and indirect dissemination of religious living. This friendship of the devotees of God belonging to different religions will have a tremendous influence in society. We have seen in India that Hindu and Mohammedan devotees not only appreciated one another but also respected one another's personalities and ways of living. In fact, they are the people who established peaceful living in Indian society by their own personal examples. This very idea is the basis of a harmonious, universal society of mankind. The more man does toward God, the greater power he will have for living in a co-operative and co-ordinated social organization. In spite of present-day disputes in India, which are created by non-religious persons — political leaders using the religion as a cloak — there will be a harmonious society when people understand the basic principles of religion and try to live according to them . . .

"The family of nations can establish harmony in spite of divergent thought patterns and aesthetic sensibilities, if we know that other cultures produce men and women of integration and spiritual realization. As the Christian missionaries in India should remember that they are ambassadors of Christian culture to India, so would the Indians like to see the best manifestation of Christian culture in them." — *Malcolm Pitt*, Kennedy School of Missions, Hartford Seminary Foundation.



*Doorways To A Happy Home.* By MRS. CLARENCE H. HAMILTON. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1950. 234 pages. \$2.50.

Many books have been written about the family — about its nature, function, history, problems, failures, and other phases. The family is a much described and analyzed institution. But new books on the family continue to come and are read with varying degrees of interest because the family is near to each of us, and readers continue to "want to know about themselves."

Here is a book which has a "get-near-to-the-reader" point of view. The aim of the book is to

provide a practical guide to achieving happiness within the home. The subtitle of the book might well be "Ways To More Abundant Living in the Home."

Each of the ten chapters consider an essential area of the home and family living. The first chapter, "Marriage Is What You Make It," centers on those relationships between man and woman and God which make for harmony and happiness.

The next five chapters deal with children in the home. Chapter Two, "Happy Children," Chapter Three, "God and Our Children," Chapter Four, "Family Patterns and Traditions," Chapter Five, "Understanding and Loving the Adolescent."

The last four chapters deal with other phases of the family life — Chapter Six, "Family Prayers," Chapter Seven, "We Are Growing Older," Chapter Eight, "The Unexpected Always Happens," Chapter Nine, "Where Do You Find Time?" and Chapter Ten, "God With Us."

The book is written primarily for women — for the wife and mother in a family. It has a conversational style and is packed with illustrations which clarify the insights which the author marshals.

Each chapter is a journey into the "Happy Home." The author is realistic in dealing with each phase of the subject. She brings the findings of psychology and the faith of religion to bear upon each topic and she clarifies her position in a humble and constructive way. This is not a dogmatic book but the conversation of one who has found happiness and wants to share it. Its strength is in its simplicity, not in new ideas nor its profundity.

Throughout the book one finds gems of practical insights into the art of building a happy home (e.g. "difficulties are resolved by clear thinking more often than strong feeling" (p. 34) "I am suggesting that (children's) prayers be, for some time, those of gratitude only" (p. 71) "A home is more than you see inside four walls and beneath a roof. It is a spiritual entity, a reality that shapes the lives of all who live there. It grows from the relationship of those who live together. It provides the one essential for the happy life of every individual. It is heaven in plain terms." (p. 212)

Such terms of the family as love, democracy, and discipline are used in terms of relationships between people and not as sentimental clichés.

The author has practical suggestions for meeting numerous family needs. In her suggestions both insight and experience are well integrated. (e.g. Disciplining of children (p. 62); Teaching children how to pray (p. 65 ff); Celebrating Christmas (p. 105); Preventing fatigue (p. 206).

The book will help young mothers, and older mothers. Husbands can read it with profit. Alert church groups ought to distribute it. — *Leonard A. Stidley*, Professor of Religious Education, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College.



## RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

### STANDING COMMITTEES

#### CHAIRMEN OF STANDING COMMITTEES

**CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE** —  
Lawrence C. Little, University of Pitts-  
burgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

**EDITORIAL** — Leonard A. Stidley, Gradu-  
ate School of Theology, Oberlin Col-  
lege.

**FINANCE** — Ernest J. Chave, Divinity  
School, University of Chicago.

**HIGHER EDUCATION** — Edward W.  
Blakeman, Pacific School of Religion.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

**SAMUEL P. FRANKLIN**, University of  
Pittsburgh, Chairman.

**LAWRENCE C. LITTLE**, University of  
Pittsburgh.

**EARL A. DIMMICK**, Superintendent of  
Pittsburgh Public Schools.

**THOMAS J. QUIGLEY**, Superintendent of  
Catholic Schools, Pittsburgh.

**SOLOMON B. FREEHOF**, Rodef Shalom  
Temple, Pittsburgh.

**LEONARD A. STIDLEY**, Graduate School  
of Theology, Oberlin College.

**EMANUEL GAMORAN**, Commission on  
Jewish Education, Cincinnati.

**ERNEST KNAUTZ**, Baldwin-Wallace Col-  
lege, Berea, Ohio.

**O. M. WALTON**, Executive Secretary,  
Council of Churches, Pittsburgh.

#### CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

**LAWRENCE C. LITTLE**, University of  
Pittsburgh, Chairman.

**ADDISON H. LEITCH**, Pittsburgh-Xenia  
Theological Seminary.

**HOWARD D. BLANK**, Veterans Adminis-  
tration Guidance Center, Pittsburgh.

**CHARLES E. MANWILLER**, Pittsburgh  
Board of Public Education.

**SAMUEL P. FRANKLIN**, University of  
Pittsburgh.

**L. B. MOSELEY**, First Baptist Church,  
Pittsburgh.

**F. L. GIBBS**, Allegheny County Council  
of Churches and Christian Education,  
Pittsburgh.

**THOMAS J. QUIGLEY**, Pittsburgh Diocese  
Catholic Schools.

**HERMAN HAILPERIN**, Rabbi, Tree of  
Life Congregation, Pittsburgh.

**HENRY A. RIDDLE**, Western Theological  
Seminary, Pittsburgh.

**FLORENCE M. TEAGARDEN**, University  
of Pittsburgh.

#### FINANCE COMMITTEE

**ERNEST J. CHAVE**, University of Chi-  
cago, Chairman.

**ROSS SNYDER**, Chicago Theological Sem-  
inary, Chicago, Ill.

**GEORGE FOX**, Rabbi, South Shore Tem-  
ple, Chicago, Ill.

**WEIGHSTILL WOODS**, Attorney, 53 W.  
Jackson Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

#### EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

For list of members of this committee see the inside front cover.

*Note:* The officers and standing committee chairmen are also members  
of the Board of Directors.

# RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

## OFFICERS

**HONORARY PRESIDENT** — George A. Coe, Claremont, Cal.

**PRESIDENT** — Samuel P. Franklin, Dean School of Education, University of Pittsburgh.

**VICE-PRESIDENTS** — Ruth M. Shriver, Church of Brethren, Elgin, Illinois, Emanuel Gamoran, Commission on Jewish Education, Cincinnati, Ohio,

and Thomas J. Quigley, Superintendent of Catholic Schools, Pittsburgh, Pa.

**TREASURER** — Weighstill Woods, Attorney, 53 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

**RECORDING SECRETARY** — O. M. Walton, Council of Churches, Pittsburgh, Pa.

## MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Edna L. Acheson — First Unitarian Church, Chicago, Ill.

Edward R. Bartlett — Iliff School of Theology, Denver, Col.

Edna M. Baxter — School of Religious Education, Hartford, Conn.

Israel S. Chipkin — American Association for Jewish Education, New York City.

Stewart G. Cole — Intercultural Education, Los Angeles, Cal.

Alexander M. Duskin — Jewish Education Committee of New York, Inc., New York City.

Harrison S. Elliott — Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

Wesner Fallaw — Andover-Newton Theological School, Newton Center, Mass.

George Fox — Rabbi, South Shore Temple, Chicago, Ill.

Solomon B. Frechhof — Rabbi, Rodef Shalom Temple, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Roland B. Gittelsohn — Rabbi, Rockville Centre, L. I.

Frank Grebe — Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York City.

Hugh Hartshorne — Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Charles E. Hendry — University of Toronto, Toronto, Ont.

Leo L. Honor — Dropsie College, Philadelphia, Pa.

Walter Howlett — Greater New York Committee on Released Time, New York City.

F. Ernest Johnson — Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, New York City.

Henry M. Johnson — Emory University, Georgia.

Gerald E. Knoff — International Council of Religious Education, Chicago, Ill.

Paul M. Limbert — Springfield College, Springfield, Mass.

E. R. MacLean — Ontario Religious Education Council, Toronto, Ont.

Donald M. Maynard — School of Theology, Boston University, Boston, Mass.

Ross Snyder — Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.

A. O. Steele — Johnson C. Smith University, Charlotte, N. Carolina.

J. Edward Sproul — National Council of Y.M.C.A., New York City.

Erwin L. Shaver — International Council of Religious Education, Chicago, Ill.

Thomas West — Trade Mark and Patent Specialist, Chicago, Ill.

J. Paul Williams — Mt. Holyoke College, S. Hadley, Mass.

## REGIONAL DIRECTORS

California — Paul Irwin, School of Religion, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

Colorado — Ira A. Morton, Iliff School of Theology, Denver.

Florida — George L. Chindahl, Maitland.

Kentucky — Myron T. Hopper, College of Bible, Lexington.

Michigan — Leon Fram, Rabbi, Temple Israel, Detroit 2.

Missouri — L. L. Leftwich, Culver-Stockton College, Canton.

New England — Ernest W. Kuebler, American Unitarian Association, Boston, Mass.

New York — Samuel L. Hamilton, New York University, New York City.

Texas — James Seehorn Seneke, Southern Methodist University, Dallas.

(Regional Directors are also Members of Board of Directors)

